

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 90-239
H. R. 14397

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 14397.	.1
Digest of Public Law 90-239	.2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 14397

- Dec. 12, 1967 House Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 14397. H. Report 1037. Print of bill and report.
- House passed H. R. 14397 as reported.
- Dec. 13, 1967 Senate committee reported H. R. 14397 with amendments. S. Report 938. Print of bill and report.
- Dec. 14, 1967 Senate passed H. R. 14397 as reported.
- Both Houses appointed conferees.
- House received conference report. H. Report 1047. Print of report.
- Dec. 15, 1967 Both Houses agreed to conference report.
- Jan. 2, 1968 Approved: Public Law 90-239.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued December 13, 1967
For actions of December 12, 1967
90th-1st; No. 203

CONTENTS

Administrative procedures.....29	General Counsel.....4	Postal rates.....2
Advisory committee.....20	Housing.....30	Poverty.....13,25
Air pollution.....27	Lands.....13,20	Publicity.....18
Appalachia.....13	Legislative accomplishments.....22	Research.....13
Appropriations.....1,13	Legislative program.....20	Social security.....10
Budget.....15	Meat inspection.....9	Supergrades.....12
Cattle industry.....17	Migrant farmers.....6	Supplemental appropriations.....13
Education.....5,19	Natural resources.....31	Taxation.....28
Electrification.....31	Nomination.....4	Textile imports.....32
Farm labor.....6,14,23	Older Americans.....7	Urban development.....21
Farm program.....16	Pay raise.....2	Water pollution.....3
Foreign aid.....26	Personnel.....2,12	Wheat.....20,24
Foreign trade.....8,32	Population explosion.....11	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference versions of pay-raise and postal rate bill and continuing appropriations measure. House passed supplemental appropriation bill. Senate received Shulman nomination to be USDA General Counsel. Sens. Dirksen and Long, Mo., introduced and discussed bills to amend Administrative Procedure Act.

SENATE

1. **APPROPRIATIONS.** By a 74-0 vote, agreed to the conference version of H. J. Res. 888, the continuing appropriations measure (see Digest 200 for provisions). This measure will now be sent to the President. pp. S18429-43
2. **PAY RAISE; POSTAL RATES.** By a 72-0 vote, agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7977, the pay-raise and postal-rates bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S18406-26

3. WATER POLLUTION. Passed without amendment S. 2760, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize research and demonstration programs for the control of lake pollution and acid and other mine water drainage, and to prevent pollution of water by oil. pp. S18448-54
4. NOMINATION. Received the nomination of Edward M. Shulman to be General Counsel of this Department, vice John C. Bagwell. p. S18477
5. EDUCATION. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 7819, the elementary and secondary education bill (p. S18378). House conferees have been appointed.
6. MIGRANT FARMERS. Sen. Williams, N. J., urged the extension and expansion of the migrant farmers' health program. pp. S18472-3
7. OLDER AMERICANS. Sen. Nelson inserted several resolutions, which include several items of interest to this Department, passed by the Allied Council of Senior Citizens of Wis. pp. S18404-6
8. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Dirksen criticized the Department of Commerce's method of computing and reporting balance-of-trade statistics. pp. S18456-7
9. MEAT INSPECTION. Sen. Mondale inserted a telegram in support of the meat inspection program. pp. S18461-4
10. SOCIAL SECURITY. Sen. Metcalf inserted several letters and articles in opposition to the conference report on H. R. 12080, the social security bill. pp. S18464-6
11. POPULATION EXPLOSION. Sen. Yarborough spoke in favor of S. 1676, to coordinate and disseminate birth-control information upon request at home and abroad, and inserted several articles on this subject. pp. S18467-70
12. PERSONNEL. Passed as reported H. R. 1411, which includes a committee amendment to provide 129 additional positions at grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 to meet certain emergency needs of several executive agencies. The committee report indicates that the majority of these new positions would be in the Departments of Transportation, HEW, and HUD. However, the report states, "The committee believes that the Commissioners should give very careful consideration to the needs of all other executive agencies, particularly those with new or substantially expanded programs, and with particular reference to the Department of Agriculture, the Post Office Department, the Veterans' Administration, and the Bureau of the Budget." (Dec. 11, pp. S18359-60)

HOUSE

13. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 307-77, as reported earlier in the day (H. Rept. 1037), H. R. 14397, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1968. The bill includes items for the Appalachia program, the poverty program, saline-water research, and the Public Land Law Review Commission. pp. H16806, H16718-25
14. FARM LABOR. A subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 4769, amended, to make the National Labor Relations Act applicable to agriculture. p. D1121

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

DECEMBER 12, 1967.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 14397]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The estimates on which the bill is based are contained in the regular budget for fiscal year 1968 (House Document No. 15), but on which action was deferred in the earlier bills due to lack of legislative authorizations. Appropriate authorizations are now pending in more or less final form. The bill also includes funds for two or three small emergency or end-of-session items.

SCOPE AND SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Formal budget estimates considered by the Committee total \$2,120,785,000. Appropriations recommended by the Committee total \$1,679,436,500, a reduction of \$441,348,500. The sum recommended for appropriation represents a reduction of \$67,713,500 below 1967 appropriations for these same items.

The table following summarizes by chapter the budget estimates considered and the amounts recommended in the bill.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1968

Report page No.	Chap- ter No.	Appropriations, fiscal year 1967 (where applicable)	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with—	
					Appropriations, fiscal year 1967 (where applicable)	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968
3	I	\$59, 650, 000	¹ \$60, 785, 000	\$54, 706, 500	—\$4, 943, 500	—\$6, 078, 500
6	II	-----	² (13, 482, 000)	12, 200, 000	+12, 200, 000	+12, 200, 000
9	III	1, 687, 500, 000	2, 060, 000, 000	1, 612, 500, 000	—75, 000, 000	—447, 500, 000
11	IV	-----	-----	30, 000	+30, 000	+30, 000
	Total	1, 747, 150, 000	2, 120, 785, 000	1, 679, 436, 500	—67, 713, 500	—441, 348, 500

¹ Excludes \$4,200,000 which was requested but previously carried as budget estimates in other appropriation bills.

² See explanatory text on page 6.

NOTE.—Sundry budget estimates in the January 24th budget for 1968 that were laid aside when the applicable regular bills for 1968 were considered because such estimates lacked legislative authorization, and which have not been considered in any subsequent appropriation bill, or this bill, aggregate \$138,182,000.

GENERAL STATEMENT

A unique feature of this measure is that not a single supplementary budget request was submitted by the President for consideration in connection with the bill. And as explained in Chapter IV for the Legislative Branch, not only does the Committee recommend laying aside two major construction proposals for consideration at some more propitious time of less fiscal stringency, but also recommends language designed to cancel the Congressional student intern program next summer.

The Committee bill principally involves the *regular annual* appropriations for the anti-poverty program, various phases of the special Appalachia program, and the saline water program. There are two or three other relatively small items which are explained under the applicable chapters of this report. These latter items account for only one-tenth of 1% of the bill total. In other words, 99.9% of the bill total is in reality an annual funding rather than supplementary to previous appropriations for fiscal 1968. No new programs are funded in the bill.

CHAPTER I

SUBCOMMITTEE

JOE L. EVINS, TENNESSEE, *CHAIRMAN*

EDWARD P. BOLAND, MASSACHUSETTS	CHARLES R. JONAS, NORTH CAROLINA
GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, ILLINOIS	WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, OHIO
ROBERT N. GIAIMO, CONNECTICUT	LOUIS C. WYMAN, NEW HAMPSHIRE
JOHN O. MARSH, JR., VIRGINIA	BURT L. TALCOTT, CALIFORNIA

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

The budget estimate for administrative expenses of the Commission is \$785,000, including \$187,000 for the expenses of the Federal Cochairman and his staff, and \$598,000 for the Federal share of the cost of supporting staff. The States for the first time will be financing one-half the cost of the Commission's technical staff in 1968.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$706,500, which is \$78,500 less than the budget estimate, and \$393,500 below the amount of appropriation in 1967. Funding for the Commission had been deferred pending the enactment of authorizing legislation extending the program, which is now provided in Public Law 90-103, approved October 11, 1967.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The \$64,200,000 budget request for this item was originally submitted in the budgets of a number of departments and agencies to carry out provisions of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$54,000,000 to cover programs in education, health, water pollution, regional development, and all other activities of the Commission, except highways and administrative expenses, which are funded separately. This is \$10,200,000 less than the total budget estimates considered, including the \$4,200,000 previously accounted for in other bills, and is \$4,550,000 less than the fiscal year 1967 amount.

The appropriation is substantially less than would have been provided under less stringent fiscal conditions, and is even less per county proportionately than in 1967 since twenty-four new counties were added by recent amendments to the authorizing Act in Public Law 90-103. Another change made by the recent amendments is to provide that funds be appropriated to the President rather than to individual agencies in order to bring about better fiscal control and to facilitate a consolidated review of the program.

Inadequate housing, lack of education and illiteracy are all matters of urgency which are being attacked in the Appalachian Regional Development Program. The third year funding of the Appalachian program here provided is directed to meeting these problems, alleviating rural poverty, and developing the region. The program, although in its incipency, has shown that it can make a major contribution in meeting these challenges.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED
IN THE BILL FOR 1968**

Department or activity	Appropriations, fiscal year 1967 (where applicable)	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, fiscal year 1967, (where applicable)	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968
INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
Appalachian Regional Commission-----	\$1, 100, 000	\$785, 000	\$706, 500	• —\$393, 500	—\$78, 500
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Appalachian Regional Development Programs--	58, 550, 000	160, 000, 000	54, 000, 000	—4, 550, 000	—6, 000, 000
Total, chapter I-----	59, 650, 000	60, 785, 000	54, 706, 500	—4, 943, 500	—6, 078, 500

† Excludes \$4,200,000 which was requested but previously carried as budget estimates in other appropriation bills.

CHAPTER II

SUBCOMMITTEE

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, WASHINGTON, *CHAIRMAN*

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, OHIO
 JOHN O. MARSH, JR., VIRGINIA
 JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., GEORGIA
 CHARLES S. JOELSON,
 NEW JERSEY

BEN REIFEL, SOUTH DAKOTA
 JOSEPH M. McDADE,
 PENNSYLVANIA
 WILLIAM H. HARRISON,
 WYOMING

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$10,000,000 to fund the activities of the saline water program. The original 1968 budget estimate for this appropriation item was \$20,982,000. However, at the time of the Committee's consideration of the 1968 fiscal year appropriation bill, current authorization for this activity existed in the amount of only \$7,500,000. Because of the immediate need for additional funding in fiscal year 1968, the total amount of the existing authorization was appropriated (Public Law 90-28, approved June 24, 1967).

In its report on the regular annual appropriation bill for this item, the Committee stated:

The total amount approved for this appropriation represents the balance of authorized funds not yet appropriated. Legislative action is currently in process for the extension of this authorization. However, pending the enactment of the legislation, the Committee has decided to pass over without prejudice the remaining balance of funds requested.

Subsequently, the additional authorization was enacted into law on June 24, 1967 (Public Law 90-30).

The \$7,500,000 appropriated under Public Law 90-28, along with the \$10,000,000 recommended in this bill, would provide total funding for this appropriation item in fiscal year 1968 of \$17,500,000. This combined total is \$10,000,000 less than the \$27,500,000 available in fiscal year 1967, and \$3,482,000 below the \$20,982,000 requested in the President's 1968 budget estimate last January.

The Committee is well aware of the major contribution that can be made to our national supply of water resources if a practical and economical desalinization process is achieved. For this reason, it has supported through the years, and continues to endorse, the objectives of the program. However, in view of the current critical need to limit Federal expenditures to an absolute minimum, the Committee is of the opinion that progress on this program should be subject to the same restraints that have been placed on other fundamental activities of the Federal Government.

In recommending this appropriation, the Committee has attempted to provide funding at a level that will maintain basic fundamental research without causing undue loss on the investment already made in

this program, and at the same time limit the appropriation to a level consistent with our current national fiscal situation.

It is to be noted that the estimate submitted to the Committee at this time is for the full amount of the authorization, and is identical to the estimate submitted last January prior to recent budgetary developments that have exerted a restraining influence on Federal expenditures.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For activities of the Public Law Review Commission as provided in Public Law 88-606, approved September 19, 1964, the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,200,000.

H.R. 12121, which was cleared for submission to the President on December 6, 1967, extended the life of the Commission until December 31, 1970, and increased the amount authorized to be appropriated by \$3,390,000.

The original budget estimate for fiscal year 1968 provided no funds for necessary studies to be performed under contract because officials of the Commission at that time did not have sufficient experience to estimate with any degree of accuracy the cost of the studies to be undertaken, nor was program planning for this purpose sufficiently complete. Since that time these deficiencies have been corrected.

The \$860,000 appropriated under Public Law 90-28, along with the \$2,200,000 recommended in this bill, would provide a total appropriation of \$3,060,000 for this activity in fiscal year 1968. This amount is \$2,153,000 above the 1967 appropriation of \$907,000, and is \$2,200,000 above the 1968 budget estimate of \$860,000.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED
IN THE BILL FOR 1968**

Department or activity	Appropriations, fiscal year 1967 (where applicable)	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, fiscal year 1967 (where applicable)	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER					
Salaries and Expenses-----	-----	(¹ \$13, 482, 000)	\$10, 000, 000	1 + \$10, 000, 000	1 + \$10, 000, 000
PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION					
Salaries and Expenses-----	-----	-----	2, 200, 000	2 + 2, 200, 000	2 + 2, 200, 000
Total Chapter II-----	-----	-----	12, 200, 000	+ 12, 200, 000	+ 12, 200, 000

¹ See page 6 for explanatory remarks.

² See page 7 for explanatory remarks.

CHAPTER III

SUBCOMMITTEE

DANIEL J. FLOOD, PENNSYLVANIA, *CHAIRMAN*

WILLIAM H. NATCHER, KENTUCKY

NEAL SMITH, IOWA

W. R. HULL, JR., MISSOURI

BOB CASEY, TEXAS

MELVIN R. LAIRD, WISCONSIN

ROBERT H. MICHEL, ILLINOIS

GARNER E. SHRIVER, KANSAS

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

The bill includes \$1,612,500,000, the exact amount of the original appropriation for fiscal year 1967 and a reduction of \$447,500,000 below the budget estimates for 1968. The total appropriation for fiscal year 1967 shown in the following table includes \$75,000,000, which was a supplemental appropriation for certain summer programs. No request was made for such summer programs in the budget estimates for fiscal year 1968. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity testified that the appropriation finally enacted in the accompanying bill will be the amount that the Office will plan its programs within for the full year; in other words, he does not anticipate asking for a supplemental appropriation for 1968. The Committee is in complete agreement with this approach. It definitely is not the intention of the Committee to supplement this appropriation at a later date.

Within the amount carried in the bill, the Committee directs that \$295,000,000 be set aside for the Job Corps, \$321,000,000 be set aside for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, \$95,000,000 be set aside for adult work training (Community Employment and Training Program), and \$352,000,000 be set aside for the Head Start Program. This earmarking will allow these programs to proceed at substantially the level maintained thus far this fiscal year, which, in turn, is approximately the level reached in 1967.

Under present circumstances, the Committee cannot approve the initiation of any new program with the funds included in the bill. As stated earlier in this report, this applies not only to the Office of Economic Opportunity but to the entire bill.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED
IN THE BILL FOR 1968**

Department or activity	Appropriations, fiscal year 1967 (where applicable)	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, fiscal year 1967 (where applicable)	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY					
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM.....	\$1, 687, 500, 000	\$2, 060, 000, 000	\$1, 612, 500, 000	—\$75, 000, 000	—\$447, 500, 000
Total, chapter III.....	1, 687, 500, 000	2, 060, 000, 000	1, 612, 500, 000	—75, 000, 000	—447, 500, 000

CHAPTER IV

SUBCOMMITTEE

GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama, *CHAIRMAN*

TOM STEED, OKLAHOMA

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, OHIO

SIDNEY R. YATES, ILLINOIS

BOB CASEY, TEXAS

ODIN LANGEN, MINNESOTA

BEN REIFEL, SOUTH DAKOTA

MARK ANDREWS, NORTH DAKOTA

LOUIS C. WYMAN, NEW HAMPSHIRE

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Only \$30,000—for the customary gratuity in the case of a deceased member—is provided in this chapter of the bill for the Legislative Branch. In addition, a provision is in the bill transferring \$135,000 (from an existing project that can be deferred) to provide for some emergency work on the west front of the Capitol Building.

While no formal estimates were received through prescribed statutory channels because of the decision of the President not to submit any supplemental estimates, several supplemental requests which had been initiated in the Legislative Branch were pending in the Bureau of the Budget. Since Legislative items are not subject to discretionary action by the Executive, the Committee felt it should consider the several items involved. But other than the two noted, none have been allowed.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The bill includes the customary gratuity provision upon the death of a Member.

Summer intern program.—Also included in the bill is a provision denying the use of funds during the remainder of fiscal year 1968 for the employment of any student congressional interns during the forthcoming summer period.

H. Res. 416, of the 89th Congress, authorizes each Member of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico to hire for two and one-half months during the period June 1 to August 31, inclusive, each year, an additional employee to be known as a "Student congressional intern", at a gross allowance of \$750. This is a dispensable item of expenditure.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Extension of the Capitol.—\$135,000 is recommended for emergency protective work to the west front of the Capitol Building. The Committee has found that some rehabilitation work, funded in the regular 1968 bill, at the Capitol Power Plant can be deferred; thus it is proposed that the \$135,000 be transferred from that project rather than appropriating new money.

The need for this work at this time has the unanimous support of the Members of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol. It will be recalled that the most obviously

deteriorated sections of the old sandstone west central front were provided with temporary shoring in the summer of 1965. The Committee was told that since that time a close watch has been kept for further signs of failures in the structure. In October of this year it was noticed one section not previously requiring bracing was sagging and cracked. An outside expert was retained, an engineering inspection was made, and a report filed. The details are in the printed hearings.

Acquisition of site, construction and equipment, additional House Office Building.—Another proposal was an item of \$500,000 relating to the general remodeling of the Longworth House Office Building and related work. The overall cost of that project, programmed in phases extending to the spring of 1971, is estimated at \$6,975,000. The initial features of the plan involved in the \$500,000 now sought are as follows: (1) In connection with remodeling the Longworth Building, work necessary to be done preliminary to letting of contracts for construction work, including development of unexcavated subbasement space for use by the Clerk of the House for storage of furniture; (2) architectural and engineering fees for preparation of contract plans and specifications for remodeling of the Congressional Hotel and construction of a pedestrian tunnel between the hotel and the Cannon Building, and other work necessary to be done preliminary to letting of construction contracts; (3) changes in the Cannon Building to provide expanded accommodations for the House Disbursing Office; (4) architectural and engineering fees for preparation of contract plans and specifications for converting unfinished third floor space in the Rayburn Building for use by committees during the remodeling of the Longworth Building; (5) development of basement space in the Cannon Building for storage of furniture by the Clerk of the House; (6) providing additional locker room space for the Capitol Police in the Longworth Building; and (7) administrative and miscellaneous expenses, as well as contingencies.

The committee gave careful consideration to the matter, but under all the circumstances, especially the present budget crisis with the consequent need to defer all postponable construction projects, the committee thought that this item could be deferred for consideration at some later and more propitious time.

Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building.—The Committee considered the request of the Architect for \$2,800,000 for drawing final plans for a third library building. The enabling legislation passed during the 89th Congress authorized appropriations of not to exceed \$75,000,000 to construct the building in square 732 and that it include a James Madison Memorial Hall. An appropriation of \$500,000 for preparation of preliminary plans, estimates of costs, and necessary models, was provided in 1965. The need for this building has been clearly and firmly established through the hearings of this Committee over the years. But as indicated earlier, the urgent need at this time is to postpone all new projects that can without undue adverse effect be postponed, and it seemed to the Committee that this ought to be done in this case.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1967 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED
IN THE BILL FOR 1968**

Department or activity	Appropriations, fiscal year 1967 (where applicable)	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, fiscal year 1967 (where applicable)	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
Gratuity to widow of deceased Member-----		-----	\$30, 000	+\$30, 000	+\$30, 000
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Extension of the Capitol-----		-----	¹ (135, 000)	-----	-----
Total, Chapter IV-----		-----	30, 000	+\$30, 000	+\$30, 000

¹ To be derived by transfer from "Expansion of facilities, Capitol Power Plant."

CHAPTER V

GENERAL PROVISION

Section 501 is standard language in all appropriation bills. It provides that all funds contained in the bill shall expire for obligation purposes at the end of the current fiscal year unless otherwise expressly provided in the language of the bill.

LIMITATION AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISION

The following limitation not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill is recommended:

On page 4, in connection with the House of Representatives:

None of the funds available to the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1968 shall hereafter be available for the purposes of House Resolution 416 of the Eighty-ninth Congress relating to the hire of student congressional interns.



90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 14397

[Report No. 1037]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DECEMBER 12, 1967

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

DECEMBER 12, 1967

Reported without amendment; considered and passed

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supple-
5 mental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Sup-
6 plemental Appropriation Act, 1968") for the fiscal year
7 ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, namely:

1

CHAPTER I

2

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

3

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

4

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5

For necessary expenses of the Federal Cochairman and
his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and
for payment of the Federal share of the administrative ex-
penses of the Commission, including services as authorized
by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles,
\$706,500.

11

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

12

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

13

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs
authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act
of 1965, as amended, except expenses authorized by section
105 and section 201 of said Act, including services as author-
ized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles,
\$54,000,000, to remain available until expended.

19

CHAPTER II

20

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

21

OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

22

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
\$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

24

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$2,200,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER III

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452, approved August 20, 1964), as amended, \$1,612,500,000, of which not more than \$500,000 shall be available for transfer to the Department of Agriculture to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of Public Law 90-95, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for transfers to the economic opportunity loan fund for loans under title III, and amounts so transferred shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, that this appropriation shall be available for the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, as authorized by section 602 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for purchase of real property for training centers: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available for contracts under titles I, II, V, VI, and VIII extending for

1 more than twenty-four months: *Provided further*, That no
2 part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be
3 available for any grant until the Director has determined
4 that the grantee is qualified to administer the funds and pro-
5 grams involved in the proposed grant: *Provided further*,
6 That all grant agreements shall provide that the General
7 Accounting Office shall have access to the records of the
8 grantee which bear exclusively upon the Federal grant.

9 CHAPTER IV

10 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

11 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 For payment to Norma W. Younger, widow of J. Arthur
13 Younger, late a Representative from the State of California,
14 \$30,000.

15 None of the funds available to the House of Representa-
16 tives for the fiscal year 1968 shall hereafter be available for
17 the purposes of House Resolution 416 of the Eighty-ninth
18 Congress relating to the hire of student congressional interns.

19 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

20 For an additional amount for "Extension of the Capitol",
21 \$135,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived
22 by transfer from the appropriation for "Expansion of
23 facilities, Capitol Power Plant".

CHAPTER V

GENERAL PROVISION

1 SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in
2 this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the
3 current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.
4
5

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 14397

[Report No. 1037]

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the
fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for
other purposes.

By Mr. MAHON

DECEMBER 12, 1967

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

DECEMBER 12, 1967

Reported without amendment; considered and passed

the House conferees, of which I served as a member. The amendment would direct the President to reclaim vessels the United States has loaned to other nations if these are used to harass or seize our fishing boats on the high seas.

This provision is particularly aimed at several Latin American countries which have used former U.S. Navy vessels on loan to them in the seizure of American tuna boats off their coasts. During our Armed Services Committee hearings on this bill, I asked the Navy to supply us information on the number of former U.S. Navy vessels that have been used in the seizure of American tuna boats off South America in the past 5 years. The Navy's report showed that a U.S. minesweeper on loan to Peru has been used to seize three American tuna boats between 1962 and 1965, and that a fleet tug and a high-speed transport on loan to the Ecuadorian Navy have been involved in the seizure of five American fishing vessels between January and August of this year.

Now, the reclaiming of loan vessels from countries that seize our fishing boats in international waters is not a permanent solution to the longstanding dispute over our rights to fish in waters inside of 200 miles off South America. However, this amendment will have the value of prodding the administration into action for a permanent solution and in showing offending nations that we mean business in maintaining our rights to sail the high seas without interference.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report on this legislation.

I commend my chairman for his leadership on this.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman for his kind reference to me.

As the gentleman understands, only combatant ships are transferred by act of Congress. A YMS, a minesweeper, would not be transferred by legislation.

As the gentleman says, no ship which we give to these people—I do not care what its type or class may be—should be used to harass our fishing fleet on the high seas.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate my wholehearted support of the remarks which the chairman of the committee has made with respect to the ship loan bill.

Testimony presented to our committee this year and over the past several years has indicated that the friendly foreign nations who are the recipients of these loans perform a function that we ourselves would have to perform if it were not for the policy of lending ships in the fashion exemplified by this bill.

The ships are old ones and they come from the reserve fleet. It is high unlikely that we would ever take them out of mothballs for our own use and I can think of no better use for them than placing them in the hands of friends to perform antisubmarine patrols and other similar activities which, as I say, we would have to do ourselves if our friends were not doing it for us.

In the case of China and Korea, there are additional requirements for these ships. Korea, for example, is subject to constant penetration by North Korean patrol boats and the lending of ships to them is merely an extension of our existing military policy with respect to this country.

As the chairman has said, the Republic of China is our good friend and from what I have heard, run these loaned ships in a highly efficient and effective fashion.

We did very well in the conference indeed—the Senate amendments that we did accept actually in each instance improved the bill.

So, I will repeat that I fully support the remarks that the chairman has made and I urge that this conference report be accepted.

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today the conference report on H.R. 6167 which authorizes the extension of several existing loans of naval vessels and the loan of three additional vessels.

When this bill was before the House on October 4 this year I voted against it. The bill has returned from conference in essentially the same form in which it left the House, and consequently I am still opposed to it.

Why am I opposed to the loan of these ships?

I am opposed because I do not think this loan is the highest and best use of American resources. I am opposed because I do not believe that the borrowing countries should be spending their dearly limited resources on the operation of obsolete navies instead of desperately necessary social programs. I am opposed because I believe that these ships may be misused to further enhance the power and prestige of military forces in countries beset with difficulties in maintaining democratic rule. I am opposed because I do not believe that the United States should, at this time be providing military assistance to the military junta that is now ruling Greece and has repressed many of the most basic rights of its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this loan is not the best use of our resources because frequently the loan of vessels is also accompanied by the extension of United States military assistance to defray part of all of the costs of operating and maintaining these vessels. These countries are all relatively poor countries with low gross national products and per capita incomes. They are struggling to raise the living standards of their people. Our contribution should mainly be in the form of economic aid, not military assistance. As Secretary McNamara said at Montreal and as many of us have realized for years, security ultimately lies not in military might but in the abolition of poverty, starvation, and deprivation.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 6167, which would extend existing loans of naval vessels to friendly nations and make three new ship loans.

The House last considered this legis-

lation on October 2. In the meantime it has become clear that along with the various loans we are making and renewing with this legislation, we must provide for the future naval security of the State of Israel.

The *Elath*, one of the two destroyers in the Israel Navy, was sunk October 21 in the Mediterranean Sea off Port Said. Egyptian forces used an up-to-date Soviet missile fired from a guided-missile PT boat.

This left the fledgling Israel Navy with only one destroyer in its fleet. Furthermore, it gave concrete foundation to reports that since the 6-day war last June the Soviet Union has been rearming Egypt with massive quantities of weapons, both conventional and sophisticated.

Five days after the sinking of the *Elath*, I introduced H.R. 13719, which would authorize the loan of a destroyer to the Israel Navy. I would hope that through this measure, this Nation could prepare itself to come to Israel's assistance should Israel require an emergency loan of a destroyer to replace the *Elath*.

Unfortunately my bill authorizing the loan of a destroyer to Israel came too late to be incorporated with the other ship loans in H.R. 6167. I hope my bill can receive prompt action by this body early in the next session.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I support this conference report on H.R. 6167 and especially so because of the fact that the committee of conference adopted the Senate provision which provided that any naval vessel loan agreement shall be immediately terminated if the President of the United States finds a country with such an agreement has seized any U.S. fishing vessel on account of its fishing activities in international waters.

I had urged the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services to accept this Senate provision and I wish to say that I am gratified with the action of the House conferees.

Now I hope the Latin American countries will sit down and iron out our differences over seizure of American fishing vessels fishing outside the 12-mile limit.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES-MEXICAN RELATIONS—LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read a letter received by the Speaker from the President of the United States.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D.C., December 6, 1967.

HON. JOHN MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR JOHN: On the third anniversary of his administration—December 1—Mexican President Diaz Ordaz held a press conference in which he was asked

to comment on the present state of United States-Mexican relations. This is how he replied:

Our relations, I believe, are at their best. I do not say they cannot be improved because everything that is human can be perfected: we can and should, as members of the government and peoples of both countries, make greater and lasting efforts to improve our relations. They are at present, however, exceedingly cordial and based fundamentally on an absolute reciprocity of respect and show of friendship and truth. I believe that deceit has no ethical justification even between enemies, but between friends it is unpardonable. The language of friends is the language of truth.

I have had the opportunity to speak to President Johnson on various problems, and I can tell you that I have always had magnificent results telling him the truth. While I am on this point, let me pay homage to a country which among its virtues knows how to listen to, not just to tolerate, the truth. It listens to it attentively, meditates on the truth which is presented to them and acts accordingly. You and I were witness to the way in which the Congress of the United States listened to our modest words of truth, not simply tolerating what we had to say, but giving cordial attention to what was said by outward signs of their assent. In this respect, Congress simply reflects one of the traditional virtues of the American people: that of knowing how to tell and how to listen to the truth.

I bring these words of tribute to the U.S. Congress and the American people to your attention, thinking that you might want to bring them to the attention of your colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 434]

Abbitt	Dwyer	Multer
Annunzio	Erlenborn	Pepper
Aspinall	Ford, Gerald R.	Poage
Bates	Fountain	Pool
Battin	Green, Oreg.	Purcell
Bell	Halleck	Resnick
Bolling	Hardy	Rosenthal
Broomfield	Harrison	St. Onge
Button	Harsha	Scott
Carter	Heckler, Mass.	Snyder
Celler	Herlong	Stratton
Cowger	King, N.Y.	Watson
Davis, Ga.	Kuykendall	Williams, Miss.
Dickinson	Lukens	Willis
Diggs	Martin	
Dulski	Mathias, Md.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 386 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 432, on December 11, 1967, a quorum call I am recorded as absent. I was

present and answered by my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

SUBSTITUTION OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 7819, THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] be relieved from further duties on the conference committee on H.R. 7819, to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] as a conferee, and the Clerk will notify the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to an order of the House on December 6, 1967, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14397) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14397, with Mr. O'HARA of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recog-

nized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Mr. Chairman, this is the 17th appropriation bill to be considered by the House of Representatives during this first session of the 90th Congress.

This is not, in the usual sense, a final supplemental appropriation bill. Some 99.9 percent of the bill is for regular annual recurring purposes—the annual budgets, rather than supplementary items. No supplemental requests were sent by the President for consideration in the closing days of the Congress. This is a unique and very unusual circumstance.

This bill contains funds in the amount of \$1,679,436,500, almost all of it in response to requests in the President's January budget. The bill before us is nearly 21 percent, or \$441,348,500 below those budget estimates. The largest item, of course, is \$1,612,500,000 for the anti-poverty program. The appropriation for this program, generally speaking, would have been provided many months ago, except for the fact that there was no authorization bill and it was not possible to put the appropriation for the anti-poverty program in the regular Labor-HEW appropriation bill earlier in the year.

HOUSE REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE SESSION

I believe it noteworthy here, as we approach the end of the session, to say that we have reduced appropriations below the President's budget estimates to a greater extent than at any time in more than a decade. So far the House, during this session, has reduced the budget estimates by some \$6.2 billion, including this bill. For the fiscal year 1968 bills only, the House will have reduced appropriations by just over \$6 billion.

It would be well to point out again that Congress is going to appropriate less for this fiscal year than for the last fiscal year, probably in the total sum of a billion dollars—perhaps a little over—depending upon the final decisions on the two bills which have not yet been finalized.

With the roughly \$6 billion which apparently we will cut the appropriation bills, in the regular bills, and with the \$3 billion additional cut in obligatory authority which was approved in the House yesterday, a total of about \$9 billion in obligatory authority has been stricken by the House from the President's budget during this session. This would indicate that the House is interested in reducing the deficit and reducing the amount of money which the Treasury must go to the market to borrow in order to carry on the functions of Government.

I believe this bill now before us is a step in the right direction.

ACTIONS PROPOSED IN THE BILL

If Members will look at the committee report they will find that there are several chapters. One involves independent offices; the Appalachia program. The

gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] is the chairman of that subcommittee.

Then we have the Interior chapter; the Office of Saline Water is involved there. There is also an item for the Public Land Law Review Commission. The chairman of that subcommittee, as you know is the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

Then we have the Office of Economic Opportunity. This is in chapter III of the bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], is the chairman of that subcommittee. This chapter contains for the Office of Economic Opportunity the same amount as was appropriated last year in the original appropriation bill for the antipoverty program; that is, \$1,612,500,000.

And may I add at this point, so that the record will be crystal clear, Mr. Speaker, that we anticipate that the Congress would look with disfavor upon any supplemental request for the antipoverty program. Whatever is finally appropriated in this bill is the amount that is to cover the entire fiscal year 1968. It is to be expected that the amount appropriated in this bill will be apportioned—as in fact the antideficiency law requires—in such manner over the year as to avoid any need for a supplemental request.

The Committee on Appropriations also took a position on the matter. I include the following excerpt from the committee report:

The bill includes \$1,612,500,000, the exact amount of the original appropriation for fiscal year 1967 and a reduction of \$447,500,000 below the budget estimates for 1968. The total appropriation for fiscal year 1967 shown in the following table includes \$75,000,000, which was a supplemental appropriation for certain summer programs. No request was made for such summer programs in the budget estimates for fiscal year 1968. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity testified that the appropriation finally enacted in the accompanying bill will be the amount that the Office will plan its programs within for the full year; in other words, he does not anticipate asking for a supplemental appropriation for 1968. The Committee is in complete agreement with this approach. It definitely is not the intention of the Committee to supplement this appropriation at a later date.

Let all responsible officials take due note of these remarks.

In the legislative branch, which is chapter IV, there was a request pending for considerably more than the House Committee on Appropriations approved. There were about \$82 million involved in 1968 and future years, including \$7 million for the proposed improvement of the Longworth Building for which an initial \$500,000 was sought. A new library building, costing some \$75 million—with \$2.8 million requested in this bill for plans—was considered. However, all of these items were laid aside at this time.

Members will also be interested in knowing that in an effort to reduce expenditures in the legislative branch we struck out funds available for the congressional student intern program, which is the summer program for interns. We did not include the legislative branch yesterday in the 2-percent reduction in personnel and in the 10-percent reduc-

tion in programs in connection with the reduction proposals in House Joint Resolution 888, because there was no feasible way to do it. There is no budget officer in the House or the Senate who has the authority or the opportunity to reduce funds available to a Member for the running of his office or to reduce funds to the chairman for the running of a committee. There was no practical way to make these reductions, so we have eliminated funds totaling several millions of dollars which normally would have been appropriated.

As I said, in a further effort to save some funds, we have eliminated funds for the student summer intern program in Congress. This comes to about \$300,000. Earlier in the year, when we had the regular legislative bill before us, we eliminated the Office of the Coordinator of Information. It is not often that an office or an agency is eliminated, but earlier in the year we did eliminate the Office of the Coordinator in an effort to bring spending more into line at a time of great fiscal urgency.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that is all that it is necessary for me to say at this time. Various members of the Committee on Appropriations are present and we would be glad to discuss any aspects of the bill which may be of interest to the Members.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Are you saying that you have eliminated the payment for the summer intern program?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. I cannot possibly

understand how you can take a position like that. I think this is one of the best programs we have ever had for the good of the country and for the training of young people. I myself have already committed myself for a young man or young woman from my district who will prepare for this work.

I think a good many young people rely on this and we should not strike this program.

(Mr. KUPFERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, we are involved in a war. We are borrowing money with which to finance the operations of the Government. The dollar is being challenged in various areas of the world. It was thought that these economies on housekeeping items of the House of Representatives could be justified. The intern program is a good program. My interns have been wonderful. I am going to try to squeeze out of my regular clerical allowance, funds with which to employ some young man or young woman for the summer. But, after all, we in Congress when calling upon the various agencies of the various departments of the Government as well as the people at home to sacrifice, and those people facing a tax increase which will probably come next year, I think we can show to the country that we, too, are tightening our own belts a bit.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend, I include a summary of the totals of the appropriation bills of the session:

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION BILL TOTALS, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF DEC. 12, 1967

(Does not include any "back door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills)

	All figures are rounded amounts		
	Bills for fiscal 1967	Bills for fiscal 1968	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered.....	\$14,411,000,000	²³ \$133,040,000,000	⁴ \$147,451,000,000
2. Amounts in 17 bills passed by House.....	14,238,000,000	²³ 126,945,000,000	141,183,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests.....	-173,000,000	⁴ -6,095,000,000	⁴ -6,268,000,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered.....	14,533,000,000	²³ 131,153,000,000	145,686,000,000
2. Amounts in 16 bills passed by Senate.....	14,457,000,000	²³ 128,937,000,000	143,394,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests.....	-76,000,000	-2,216,000,000	-2,292,000,000
4. Compared with House amounts in these 16 bills.....	+219,000,000	+3,672,000,000	+3,891,000,000
C. Final actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered.....	14,533,000,000	²³ 127,334,000,000	141,867,000,000
2. Amounts approved in 15 bills enacted.....	14,394,000,000	²³ 122,759,000,000	137,153,000,000
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests.....	-139,000,000	-4,575,000,000	-4,714,000,000

¹ Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about \$15,212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968.

² Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget, \$980,000,000; House bill, \$925,000,000; Senate bill, \$955,000,000; enacted, \$925,000,000) and for grants-in-aid for airports (budget, \$75,000,000; House bill, \$65,000,000; Senate bill, \$75,000,000; enacted, \$70,000,000).

³ And participation sales authorizations as follows: Total authorizations requested in budget, \$4,300,000,000; total in House bills, \$1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, \$4,085,000,000; total enacted, \$4,250,000,000.

⁴ Excludes \$138,182,000 budget estimates not considered in any appropriation bill.

Note: Table prepared Dec. 12, 1967, in the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the distinguished ranking member of the minority of the Committee on Appropriations.

I should like to say to the chairman of the full committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], that I subscribe wholeheartedly to his views with reference to the intern program. However, I have just one question in mind: I plan to provide out of my regular staff allowance funds to pay one or two interns next summer. But if that carries me over the maximum number of permissible employees, am I correct in thinking that I cannot hire any interns, even though I plan to pay for them out of my regular clerk-hire allowance?

Mr. BOW. I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGREGOR] that he is correct. There is a limitation as to the number of employees each Member of Congress can have on his staff. If you have not exceeded that number of employees, you can then hire interns from your present allowance.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Of course I yield to the distinguished chairman of the full committee.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, if there is a problem of paramount significance on this question, then, undoubtedly the matter will be presented to the Committee on House Administration for resolution.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to hear the gentleman from Texas say that, and I hope there will be an opportunity for all of us to hire interns and still save money as recommended here by the Appropriations Committee, but be able to make provision for the employment of interns within the regular monetary allowances which are prescribed for Members of the House.

Mr. BOW. That is a matter, as the chairman stated, for consideration of the Committee on House Administration. If they allow it, you can do it. You can hire from your regular allowance, but not from the funds as provided for under House Resolution 416.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the gentleman from Ohio very much. In my opinion that represents a needed clarification of the situation in which we find ourselves.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. I would like for the record to indicate and reflect the fact that it is my understanding it would also cut out the funds for planning which would enable us to move forward on the 1st of January 1969, with the renovation and expansion of Members' offices from two rooms to three rooms in the Longworth Building; is that correct?

Mr. BOW. That is correct. And, I may say to the gentleman from New York that this matter will be considered again by the Committee on Appropriations in January or February of next year.

However, permit me to say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], and I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN], will discuss that further. But, when we begin talking about the amount that is involved in that program one has to stop and take a good look at it.

I understand that there was also a suggestion that we build a tunnel from the Longworth Building over to the Congressional Hotel. There is no reason to expend large sums to remodel the Congressional Hotel for only 2 years' use. Based upon the present fiscal situation I feel that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] are absolutely correct in what they have done.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] said this morning that there have been so many tunnels under that street over there now, he just wonders how it holds up. I wish to say at this time that I agree with the gentleman completely. I think that the bill as presented represents a great job. However, my understanding is that any Member in the Longworth Building who needs a third office will be able to get one.

However, in my honest opinion, we have to make the point that the Congress of the United States has to go along with the rest of the Government under the resolution which was adopted by the House yesterday.

The Congress itself, as the distinguished gentleman from Texas has pointed out, over the last 2 years has made very substantial reductions in its own spending.

This is one way in which we can go along with what we did yesterday in having the Congress reduce spending.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to make the RECORD clear that I am not objecting to saving money, and saving money in this instance, but I believe the Members ought to know specifically what the cuts are that are being made.

I would say to the gentleman it is also important that they understand that under the limitation of space that we have here in the House of Representatives it is very unlikely that very many Members of the Longworth Building will have an extra room. We are at the moment, in the renovation of the Cannon Building, reduced to eight annexes available to Members. This is done on the basis of seniority, and this makes for a far less number of Members who can have a third room. This is a sacrifice that I believe perhaps should be made under the circumstances, and the Members should understand that the improvements have been taken out because we face a fiscal crisis here, and they will continue to use the Longworth Building and get along with two rooms for a longer period than otherwise would have been the case.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEN. In explanation of the matter of rooms, as far as the Longworth Building is concerned, I believe it should be known by this House that the procedure that has been recommended by the committee will actually provide more room than it would under the remodeling plan as requested. Just as soon as the second half of the Cannon Building is completed, which will be next summer some time, they will move some 75 Members out of the Longworth Building into the Cannon Building, and this will make 75 suites available in addition to what is there now. However, if you start the second part of the remodeling program as proposed, take half of the offices out of the Longworth Building and the Members will be hampered for space for a much longer time than by following this course.

Let me just add one other thing, it has already been pointed out, in view of the budgetary situation, this seems to be a likely expenditure that could be delayed at least for this time.

It is my opinion that the two major building requests ought not to have been considered in the supplemental to begin with, because it does involve a very intricate remodeling plan not only in the Longworth Building, but also the Congressional Hotel, creating new suites all through the hotel. This ought to have a more detailed consideration than we could give it in this very limited time. I think it would serve the best interests of the House and the country to not approve these building projects at this time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen.

I shall not take much more time on these preliminaries because the ranking members of the subcommittees involved will handle their portions of the bill. They have done a magnificent job, the chairmen and the ranking minority members, in handling this appropriation bill.

This is one of the last appropriation bills we will have in this session. I hope it is the last one we will have.

But I should like to take this opportunity to express to the majority the appreciation of the minority for the courtesies that have been extended to us. My distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas, has been most cooperative, and has given the minority members full opportunity to work with the majority.

I believe that in the Committee on Appropriations there has been cooperation between the two parties to try to do what we believe is for the best interests of our Nation. I do want to take this last opportunity on this last appropriation bill to pay tribute to the gentleman from Texas, the chairmen of the several subcommittees, and also to say that I believe that the minority members have cooperated to the fullest extent. As the ranking minority member, I appreciate what the minority members have done to support me this session.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time from this side.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], have said, this is a supplemental appropriation bill, and the last one for this year. There are five titles in the pending bill, or, rather, five chapters in the bill.

The Subcommittee on Independent Offices was concerned with title I, one section of the bill; namely, the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The reason appropriations for this agency were not considered earlier is the fact that legislation was only recently reenacted for a 2-year period and was signed into law on October 11, last.

The highway portion of Appalachia was for a 6-year period and the funds for that portion of the program have already been appropriated and included in the Department of Commerce appropriation bill.

The programs of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission are funded in three separate items.

Funds for the highway portion—the budget recommended \$100,000,000—we have previously approved and appropriated \$70,000,000 for this purpose.

The reason we could consider this earlier was that the highway portions of the program were authorized for 6 years, whereas the nonhighway programs were authorized for 2 years and had to be reenacted.

Legislation extending the program was approved only on October 11, last. Appalachian Regional Development Commission's activities cover 13 States, 397 counties—24 new counties were added by recent amendments. Some 19,000,000 people live in Appalachia or Appalachian States. The overall budget requests total \$164,985,000. The committee has cut \$40,278,500 from the overall budget requests. We are providing \$124,706,500 for the Appalachian highway and other development programs. As the highway funds have previously been appropriated, we are considering only two items: First, administrative expenses of the Commission, and second, funds for the development programs including education, health, water pollution, supplemental grants for regional development, and other activities of the Commission.

For the Commission, the budget recommended \$785,000. The committee has approved and recommended \$706,500. This is a cut of \$78,500—a 10-percent cut.

Last year the Congress appropriated \$1,100,000 for this purpose so we have made some economies.

Under the law, the Congress provided the full funding for the Commission for the first 2 years.

This is the first year that the States are required to pay 50 percent of the administrative costs of the technical staff. The Federal Government shares in 50 percent of the cost of the Commission's staff, and pays all the expense of the staff of the Federal Cochairman.

In the continuing resolution passed yesterday, we provided for 2-percent and 10-percent cuts in administrative costs and programs.

Here we have provided 10-percent cuts in both administrative and program operations.

Concerning the nonhighway programs—programs of education, health, water pollution, regional development, supplemental grants for public facilities and forestry, among others—the budget recommended \$64,200,000. The committee has approved \$54,000,000—a cut and reduction of \$10,200,000 for development programs.

I want to mention two items in this connection.

The first is an item recommended by the budget for \$1,200,000 for mine area restoration in the Department of Interior budget. This was denied earlier before passage of authorization to extend the program.

The second item of \$3,000,000 was considered in the public works appropriations bill for sewage treatment facilities. This amount was approved for this purpose—but for the entire Nation—not for the Appalachian region.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the committee earlier had cut and reduced the highway program by 30 percent.

In the pending bill, the nonhighway programs were cut by 17 percent, and funds for the administrative expenses of the Commission were reduced by 10 percent. Overall this represents a 25-percent cut.

However, the funds appropriated represent a lump-sum appropriation and the Commission and Governors of the Appalachian States may transfer and apply the funds to programs which they accord the highest priority and need.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. While the gentleman is on that point, I think that it would interest the Members to know and the RECORD should show that while these are substantial cuts that in most of these programs they do have large carryover funds that they have not been able to commit heretofore.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. There are some, I will say to my friend. Now the program is well underway and they are ready to move forward. It has taken a period of time for the initial planning and to develop coordination with the Governors of the several States.

The President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty recently made recommendations that unquestionably will have a substantial impact on the formation of future national policy and programs in Appalachia, which has the Nation's greatest concentration of the rural poor.

The Commission in its report disclosed that 14 million rural Americans are living in poverty.

The Commission justifiably described this as a national disgrace.

The report by the Commission pointed out that—

In our cities one in every eight persons is poor.

In our suburban areas one of every 15 persons is poor.

But that in our rural areas one of every four persons is classified as poor.

Thirty percent of the Nation's total population lives in rural America—and 40 percent of this rural population is considered and classified as being poor, according to the Commission study and report.

The committee considered a budget of \$35 million for the supplemental grants-in-aid program. This program enables States, local governments, and other applicants to take advantage of existing Federal grant-in-aid programs. This phase of the Appalachian program is devoted primarily to educational and health programs.

The committee considered a recommendation of \$3,000,000 for demonstration health projects.

This program includes grants for the planning, construction and operation of multicounty health facilities.

Seven States have multicounty projects planned or underway under this program.

The maximum Federal contribution for construction under this program is 80 percent—100 percent of the first 2 years of operation and 50 percent of operational costs thereafter.

The budget recommended \$3,000,000 which the committee considered for the land stabilization program.

This program authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts of up to 10 years with landholders for conservation practices.

The maximum Federal contribution for this program is 80 percent.

The committee considered a budget recommendation of \$4,600,000 for the mine area restoration program.

This program includes the reclamation and rehabilitation of land affected by waste piles and fire extinguishment projects.

The committee considered \$1 million for the Appalachian low-cost housing program to provide technical assistance grants and advances for the development of low-cost housing projection under section 221 of the National Housing Act.

This new program was authorized by recent amendments to the act. This money operates as a revolving fund.

The committee considered \$2 million for the Appalachian water resource survey.

This survey is a comprehensive plans for development and utilization of water resources in the Appalachian region and is being prepared by the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

The committee considered \$12,000,000 for the vocational education facilities program—for the construction and equipping of vocational education facilities. These funds are used almost exclusively for construction.

The committee considered \$2,000,000 for sewage treatment facilities—for construction of sewage treatment plants. These funds are in addition to funds allocated to the States in the basic nationwide sewage treatment program under Public Law 660.

The purpose of the Appalachian development program is to build upon the many Federal, State, and local efforts to provide the Appalachian region with the

means of developing a self-sufficient and self-sustaining economy.

The purpose of this program is to provide the spadework for growth and progress; to open the way for our great free enterprise system to provide jobs and opportunities for our people.

This program supplements existing Federal programs by providing for more activity, by redirecting existing efforts, and by providing the means of making them more effective.

I want to point out also that this program is different from the traditional pattern of Federal grant-in-aid programs in that—

Major responsibility is given to the Governors of the participating States in the planning and carrying out of the program. The Appalachian program vests the basic responsibility for project and program decisions with the Governors.

A great degree of interstate cooperation is being achieved through the framework of the Appalachian program. Allocations of funds appropriated are being accomplished by agreements among Governors. Allocation formulas have been developed and plans are being coordinated, and

The third innovation in the program concept is the manner of carrying out the program. Each State develops its own investment and development plan, and establishes priorities for projects.

The Appalachian regional development program is attacking the basic and elemental problems that affect the Appalachian region—problems of access, lack of education, lack of public facilities, lack of adequate vocational training, and housing, among others.

The Appalachian program is designed and directed to meet these problems—to alleviate rural poverty by providing jobs and opportunities for the people of Appalachia, and to develop the region and its economy.

Although this program is in its early stages, this program has demonstrated already that it can make a major contribution toward the solution of these problems and the meeting of these challenges.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the discussion between the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGREGOR] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] on the section dealing with summer interns, makes clear that there must be a further explanation of the intention of the committee in its drafting of that section.

It would appear from first reading that the committee intended an absolute prohibition of the use of any funds of the House of Representatives to implement or to finance the summer intern program. That interpretation would indicate that the committee had in mind a determination to repeal House Resolution 416, but certainly this is not true. The committee intended only to eliminate the funding of the program from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives from which it is now funded. It wanted to effect economy by cutting out the use of that fund for this purpose.

However, the committee never intended to control the use of clerk hire funds which are used by Members of Congress for the payment of staff salaries. The committee never contemplated that a Member could not use a part of the money made available to him for clerk hire, for the purpose of employing a summer intern. House Resolution 416 provides in part as follows:

Resolved, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, each Member of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico are authorized to hire for two and one-half months during the period June 1 to August 31, inclusive, each year, one additional employee to be known as a student congressional intern.

The resolution also says this:

Such allowance to such intern shall be in addition to all allowances and personnel made available to each Member or the Commissioner under other provisions of law.

The effect of the action of the committee was to eliminate the extra monetary allowances for the intern program. It did not eliminate the authorization for the employment of a summer intern—an extra person—in addition to the personnel made available to each Member under law.

In my opinion, therefore, Mr. Chairman, the provision in the bill must be interpreted not to prohibit absolutely the use of all House of Representative funds for the payment of a salary to a summer intern, but only to eliminate the use of the contingent funds of the House which are now used for the purpose. Members may still use their regular clerk hire appropriation for the purpose.

All that is being done in this bill is prohibiting the use of funds from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives for this purpose. But I would say that, as I read this resolution, if the gentleman from Minnesota wanted to hire a summer intern and pay that summer intern out of his allowances for his staff, he could do so.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman mean that I could do so, even if by so hiring I would exceed the number of staff assistants I am regularly entitled to?

Mr. YATES. As I understand the rules of the House now, as promulgated by the House Administration Committee, the gentleman is entitled to have 11 members on his staff. As I read this resolution, this authorizes the gentleman to appoint one extra person for 2½ months during that period, to be paid no longer out of the funds which were allocated for the purpose previously, but the gentleman may pay that person now out of his regular staff allowances.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words in opposition to the deletion of the intern program. I find interns serve a very use-

ful purpose. The program has been helpful to young people, has given persons of modest means opportunities to serve on the staff of a Congressman and to observe at first hand the functioning of our leading democratic institution. The interns have helped Congressmen get a tremendous volume of work done during the summer, when many of the regular staff are on vacation.

This intern program has helped to arouse among young people an interest in their Government, to say nothing of helping the young people go to college.

Furthermore, I think the House abandoning this program would be abandoning an important and glamorous program to the Senate. One of the Senators in my State has 17 summer interns. Increasingly, we all know, the Senate has become the glamour body that is capturing the minds of the young people. I am not sure we ought to be fostering this trend by this type of action.

Furthermore, it used to be that we could get free summer interns. I have had as high as seven people working in my office for nothing. Since we have started to pay them, and now the Senate is running its very elaborate program, it has become impossible to get young people as interns to work free. This provision means the abandonment of what to me has become one of the most valuable programs we have had to offer young people.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN].

[Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.]

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I was disappointed by the action taken by the House Committee on Appropriations to eliminate funds for the summer internship program. My office has participated in the program and I have been extremely impressed with its results.

There were two student interns in my office last summer. Not only were they of great assistance to me and my staff, but they made it clear to me that this opportunity turned out to be an unforgettable experience. Both young men have returned to their communities better informed on the functions of Congress and more enlightened as to the role of the legislative branch.

It seems to me that this action gives the appearance of the House of Representatives turning its back on the youth of America. At a time when we are attempting to bridge the "generation gap," this action is both nearsighted and backward. The youth of today have inquisitive minds, a healthy sign of the times. The least we can do is to assist them in appreciating and understanding the problems we face as legislators and also to give them an opportunity to be involved on the periphery of Government.

I urge the House to reconsider its action when we reconvene in January. Let us not close our doors—our minds—our hearts—on the most valuable asset we have.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, your committee has done its best to limit the requests for additional moneys in the legislative requests to comply with the difficult budget situation. It is proper that the legislative branch should give the same concern to its expenses as we have suggested to the rest of the departments of Government. It is for this reason that we did not approve more than \$10 million of expenditures that are not essential at this time. We ought to set an example of prudence for all of Government to follow. The continuing deficits and threat of inflation must be dealt with, or even more serious problems will develop for taxpayers and consumers. The national debt grows and interest rates are going up, so I hope the House will sustain the recommendations of the committee in the interest of economy.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLODY].

(Mr. McCLODY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, my experience with the congressional summer intern program has been most gratifying. The college students from my congressional district who have served in my office during the past 3 years have contributed valuably to the work product. Their attendance at committee hearings, their research on a variety of legislative subjects, their attention to innumerable details and their observations based upon their experiences are among the benefits which I have noted.

In addition, it is my feeling that the intimate contact with the lawmaking process and related work of the Congress has been of inestimable benefit to the student interns and to the entire academic community.

I fear that the careless selection of some interns and the injudicious and irresponsible behavior of some publicity-seeking beneficiaries of the college intern program are responsible for the decision to bar interns during the 1968 summer vacation period.

The long-range value of the congressional intern program should be evident to all. It is short sighted and pennywise economy to eliminate the program.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Appropriations Subcommittee.

(Mrs. HANSEN of Washington asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, chapter II of this bill contains two items for the Department of Interior and related agencies. Ten million dollars is provided for salaries and expenses for the Office of Saline Water, and \$2,200,000 is provided for salaries and expenses for the Public Land Law Review Commission.

The President's 1968 budget estimate included \$20,982,000 for the saline water

program. However, at the time of the committee's consideration for the 1968 fiscal year appropriation bill, current authorization for this activity existed in the amount of only \$7,500,000. Because of the immediate need for additional funding in fiscal year 1968, the total amount of the existing authorization was appropriated. Subsequently, the additional authorization was enacted into law on June 24, 1967, Public Law 90-30.

The \$7,500,000 appropriated under Public Law 90-28, along with the \$10 million recommended in this bill would provide total funding for this appropriation item in fiscal year 1968 of \$17,500,000. This combined total is \$10 million less than the \$27,500,000 available in fiscal year 1967, and \$3,482,000 below the \$20,982,000 requested in the President's 1968 budget estimate last January.

The saline water program was initiated in fiscal year 1953. Since that time, research efforts have continued in the quest for a practical and economical means of water desalinization. It would appear that considerable progress has been made during this period. In the early stages of the program, the cost of water provided through the desalinization process was \$5 per thousand gallons. Witnesses testifying before the committee a few days ago stated that this cost has now been reduced to 22 cents per thousand gallons. The committee is informed that technical ability is now available for a plant with production of 150 million gallons of water a day by this process, and the technical feasibility for a plant producing 1 billion gallons of water per day is imminent.

Mr. CONTE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment which would prevent the use of the appropriation for the Office of Saline Water for paying salaries or expenses for any foreign travel or other activity outside the United States, except in connection with activities of the U.S. Government such as the desalting plant at the Naval Base at Guantanamo. Information came to my attention only yesterday to the effect that personnel of the Office of Saline Water have made many trips to foreign countries offering their services as consultants for building salt water conversion plants. Unfortunately I received this information after the Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee had completed its hearings last week on the appropriation requested for the balance of fiscal 1968 for the Office of Saline Water. Thus it was too late to obtain adequate information on the extent of such overseas activity by OSW personnel. On page 647 of the printed appropriations hearings I note that Chairman HANSEN inquired as to what percentage of the funds of the Office of Saline Water is spent in the international field. She was told that about 2 percent of their personnel budget is spent annually for this purpose. None of the discussion between Mr. Savage of OSW and Chairman HANSEN brought forth the fact that the Office of Saline Water has for the past

several months been serving as an adviser for the procurement of a salt water conversion plant for the Government of Saudi Arabia. Mr. Savage was not asked the direct question, but he surely volunteered no information on this relationship during the general interrogation about OSW's international activities.

I think the House of Representatives is entitled to know just what the Office of Saline Water is up to. This morning, during our full Appropriations Committee meeting, I consulted Mrs. HANSEN and Congressman REIFEL about this matter and they both kindly agreed to obtain any information about OSW's activities that I might ask for. I intend to take advantage of this offer and to ask Mrs. HANSEN, as chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, to inquire further into this matter and to let the House know what she finds.

I do not care to get into the merits of specific problems but I am told that the Office of Saline Water insisted that all bids on a plant for the Government of Saudi Arabia be confined to a multistage flash evaporator plant which was designed by or for the Office of Saline Water. I have seen a number of references in the press to the fact that several privately owned American companies have greater technical knowledge in the design and construction of multistage flash evaporator plants than has the Office of Saline Water or any other Government agency. If that information is correct I am curious to know why the Office of Saline Water has taken this restrictive attitude. And I am especially curious to know why the Office of Saline Water accepted the role of agent for a foreign government in the first place. When foreign governments or foreign industrial concerns procure heavy mechanical or electrical equipment under the U.S. Agency for International Development program they frequently employ qualified private consultants to advise them and assist them to procure equipment that is modern, reliable, and economical. I do not understand why the Office of Saline Water assumes the role that is normally filled by privately owned architect-engineer concerns.

The first appropriation for the activities of the Office of Saline Water was for the fiscal year 1953. According to a table inserted in the hearings last week, OSW has received a total of \$121,640,000 for their programs. They have spent vast amounts of money, either directly or under contracts with industries, universities, research laboratories, and others, researching and developing almost every conceivable facet of the technology of water conversion; yet I understand they have never designed or built a water conversion plant which has been successful by economic standards.

The only community in the United States today that relies on desalted water for its daily needs is Key West, Fla. The desalting plant that this community now uses was designed and built by a private American company. The Office of Saline Water had nothing to do with it. The Key West plant works dependably and economically and furnishes ample proof that U.S. industry is fully qualified to do

whatever needs to be done in the field of salt water conversion.

I notice that at page 655 of the hearings before the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. Savage, of the Office of Saline Water, let Congressman REIFEL assume that this program, not private industry, had reduced the cost of converting salt water to fresh from \$5 per thousand gallons to 22 cents per thousand gallons. I would appreciate having an explanation from the Office of Saline Water as to who brought the cost of desalting down to 22 cents per thousand gallons. Can private industry build a plant without any subsidy to produce fresh water from salt water for 22 cents per thousand gallons? Is private industry able and qualified to do the prototype work the Office of Saline Water is conducting for the Metropolitan Water District project in Los Angeles, Calif.? The hearings last week mentioned studies by the Office of Saline Water for a desalting plant in Israel. If private industry can do this work, why is the Office of Saline Water spending Government funds for this purpose?

If there is any justification for overseas activity of this type by the Office of Saline Water, it seems to me its funds should be budgeted under the foreign aid program where it can be subjected to the review of the Foreign Affairs Committee and of the Foreign Aid Appropriations Subcommittee. I do not believe we can let agencies of the Government conduct their own foreign aid activity. The administration has had many reviews and reorganizations to prevent foreign aid from being furnished from all over the Government. Congress has created and insisted that foreign aid be conducted by the Agency for International Development. I would like to be informed why the foreign activities of the Office of Saline Water should not be made to conform to this philosophy.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. As you are probably aware, the authorizing legislation of the saline water program does provide for the interchange of information on saline water research between the United States and foreign countries. However, there is no legislative authority that specifically provides for the active participation of saline water officials in the actual award of construction contracts for foreign plants.

Officials of the saline water program, of course, may consult and advise with officials of foreign governments, and give various technical advice on the requirements of any proposed plant. However, I can say that to date, no construction of foreign plants has been funded by any appropriations to the saline water program. The country building the plant is required to furnish its own construction funds and is responsible for the selection of the contractor for the construction of the plant. As I have previously mentioned, officials of the saline water program do give technical advice on the preliminary plans and designs for the plants.

The committee will be glad to cooperate with the gentleman in securing whatever additional information he desires on the activities of the saline water program.

If the gentleman will refer to our hearings on the annual 1968 appropriation he will find that the foreign activities of the saline water program are described rather thoroughly.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. For activities of the Public Land Law Review Commission the bill provides \$2,200,000.

The original budget estimate for fiscal year 1968 provided no funds for necessary studies to be performed under contract because officials of the commission at that time did not have sufficient experience to estimate with any degree of accuracy the cost of the studies to be undertaken, nor was program planning for this purpose sufficiently complete. Since that time the necessary information has been developed.

H.R. 12121, which was cleared for submission to the President on December 6, 1967, extends the life of the commission until December 31, 1970, and increases the amount authorized to be appropriated by \$3,390,000.

In the opinion of the committee, this is a most important activity, especially when one considers the fact that the recommendations of this commission will be applicable to 740,695,844 acres of Federal land or about one-third of the total acreage in the United States. The importance of this activity is further enhanced when consideration is given to the fact that the major receipts from these public lands during fiscal year 1966 amounted to \$632,000,000.

The \$860,000 appropriated under Public Law 90-28, along with the \$2,200,000 recommended in this bill, will provide a total appropriation of \$3,060,000 for this activity in fiscal year 1968. This amount is \$1,153,000 above the 1967 appropriation of \$907,000 and is \$2,200,000 above the 1968 budget estimate of \$860,000.

In recommending this appropriation, the committee was mindful of the tremendous task facing the commission in its review of all our national laws pertaining to public lands, and recognized the need for various contract studies to be initiated as soon as possible so that the commission will have adequate time to review the reports emanating from these studies in making its recommendations prior to December 31, 1970, of the revisions and changes that should be made in our public lands statutes.

I earnestly recommend the approval of these two items by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14397) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the

bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 307, nays 77, answered "present" 1, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

YEAS—307

Adair	Delaney	Howard
Adams	Dellenback	Hull
Addabbo	Dent	Hunt
Albert	Diggs	Jchord
Anderson, Ill.	Dingell	Irwin
Andrews,	Donohue	Jacobs
N. Dak.	Dorn	Jarman
Arends	Dow	Joelson
Ashley	Downing	Johnson, Pa.
Ayres	Dulski	Jonas
Baring	Duncan	Jones, Ala.
Barrett	Dwyer	Jones, Mo.
Battin	Eckhardt	Karsten
Belcher	Edmondson	Karth
Berry	Edwards, Calif.	Kastenmeier
Betts	Edwards, La.	Kazen
Blester	Eilberg	Kee
Bingham	Esch	Keith
Blackburn	Eshleman	Kelly
Blanton	Evans, Colo.	King, Calif.
Blatnik	Evins, Tenn.	Kirwan
Boggs	Fallon	Kluczynski
Boland	Farbstein	Kupferman
Bolton	Fascell	Kyl
Bow	Feighan	Kyros
Brademas	Findley	Laird
Brasco	Fino	Landrum
Bray	Flood	Langen
Brock	Foley	Leggett
Brooks	Fraser	Lloyd
Brotzman	Frelinghuysen	Long, Md.
Brown, Calif.	Friedel	McCarthy
Brown, Mich.	Fulton, Pa.	McCulloch
Brown, Ohio	Fulton, Tenn.	McDade
Broyhill, Va.	Gallifanakis	McDonald,
Burke, Fla.	Gallagher	Mich.
Burke, Mass.	Gardner	McEwen
Burton, Calif.	Garmatz	McFall
Burton, Utah	Gialmo	Macdonald,
Bush	Gibbons	Mass.
Byrne, Pa.	Gilbert	MacGregor
Byrnes, Wis.	Gonzalez	Machen
Cabell	Goodell	Mahon
Cahill	Goodling	Mailliard
Carey	Gray	Mathias, Calif.
Casey	Green, Pa.	Matsunaga
Celler	Griffiths	May
Clark	Grover	Mayne
Clausen,	Gude	Meeds
Don H.	Halpern	Meskill
Cleveland	Hamilton	Michcl
Cohelan	Hammer-	Miller, Calif.
Collier	schmidt	Miller, Ohio
Conable	Hanley	Mills
Conte	Hanna	Minish
Conyers	Hansen, Wash.	Mink
Corbett	Harvey	Minshall
Corman	Hathaway	Monagan
Culver	Hawkins	Moore
Cunningham	Hechler, W. Va.	Moorhead
Daddario	Helstoski	Morgan
Daniels	Hicks	Morris, N. Mex.
Davis, Ga.	Hollifield	Morse, Mass.
Dawson	Holland	Morton
de la Garza	Horton	Mosher

Moss	Riegle	Stubblefield
Murphy, Ill.	Roberts	Sullivan
Murphy, N.Y.	Robison	Taft
Myers	Rodino	Talcott
Natcher	Rogers, Colo.	Teague, Tex.
Nedzi	Ronan	Tenzer
Nelsen	Rooney, N.Y.	Thompson, N.J.
Nix	Rooney, Pa.	Tiernan
O'Hara, Ill.	Rostenkowski	Tunney
O'Hara, Mich.	Roth	Udall
O'Konski	Roudebush	Ullman
Olsen	Roush	Van Deerlin
O'Neill, Mass.	Roybal	Vander Jagt
Ottinger	Rumsfeld	Vanik
Patten	Ruppe	Vigorito
Pelly	Ryan	Waldie
Pepper	St Germain	Walker
Perkins	Sandman	Wampler
Pettis	Saylor	Watkins
Philbin	Scheuer	Watts
Pickle	Schneebell	Whalen
Pike	Schweiker	Whalley
Pirnie	Schwengel	White
Poff	Shipley	Widnall
Pollock	Shriver	Williams, Pa.
Price, Ill.	Sikes	Wilson, Bob
Pryor	Sisk	Wilson,
Pucinski	Skubitz	Charles H.
Quie	Slack	Wolf
Quillen	Smith, Iowa	Wright
Railsback	Smith, N.Y.	Wyatt
Randall	Smith, Okla.	Wylder
Rees	Springer	Wylie
Reid, Ill.	Stafford	Wyman
Reid, N.Y.	Staggers	Yates
Reifel	Stanton	Young
Reinecke	Steed	Zablocki
Reuss	Steiger, Ariz.	Zwach
Rhodes, Ariz.	Steiger, Wis.	
Rhodes, Pa.	Stephens	

NAYS—77

Abernethy	Gathings	Nichols
Andrews, Ala.	Gettys	O'Neal, Ga.
Ashbrook	Gross	Passman
Ashmore	Gubser	Pool
Bennett	Gurney	Price, Tex.
Bevill	Hagan	Rarick
Brinkley	Haley	Rivers
Buchanan	Hall	Rogers, Fla.
Burleson	Hansen, Idaho	Satterfield
Cederberg	Hays	Schadeberg
Chamberlain	Henderson	Scherle
Clancy	Hungate	Selden
Clawson, Del	Hutchinson	Smith, Calif.
Colmer	Jones, N.C.	Stuckey
Cramer	Kleppe	Taylor
Curtis	Kornegay	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	Latta	Thompson, Ga.
Denney	Lennon	Thomson, Wis.
Devine	Lipscomb	Tuck
Dole	Long, La.	Utt
Dowdy	McClory	Whitener
Edwards, Ala.	McClure	Whitten
Everett	McMillan	Wiggins
Fisher	Marsh	Winn
Flynt	Mize	Zion
Fuqua	Montgomery	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Waggonner

NOT VOTING—47

Abbott	Ford,	Martin
Anderson,	William D.	Mathias, Md.
Tenn.	Fountain	Multer
Annunzio	Green, Ore.	Patman
Aspinall	Halleck	Poage
Bates	Hardy	Purcell
Bell	Harrison	Resnick
Bolling	Harsha	Rosenthal
Broomfield	Hébert	St. Onge
Broyhill, N.C.	Heckler, Mass.	Scott
Button	Herlong	Snyder
Carter	Hosmer	Stratton
Cowger	Johnson, Calif.	Watson
Derwinski	King, N.Y.	Williams, Miss.
Dickinson	Kuykendall	Willis
Erlenborn	Lukens	
Ford, Gerald R.	Madden	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gerald R. Ford for, with Mr. Waggonner against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Scott against.

Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Martin against.

Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Johnson of California for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Aspinall for, with Mr. Abbitt against.
Mr. Bates for, with Mr. Kuykendall against.Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Cowger against.
Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Snyder against.Mr. Carter for, with Mr. Dickinson against.
Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Watson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Madden with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Button.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Herlong with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. DOLE, Mr. PRICE of Texas, and Mr. McCURE changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CALL PRIVATE AND CONSENT CALENDARS AND FOR THE SPEAKER TO RECOGNIZE MEMBERS UNDER THE SUSPENSION OF THE RULES PROCEDURE ON FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to call the Private and Consent Calendars and for the Speaker to recognize Members under the suspension of the rules procedure on Friday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the majority leader please explain this just a little bit further?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, I should be delighted to.

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. First, may I say that up to now we have only three bills on the Consent Calendar and 10 on the Private Calendar.

Mr. HALL. Plus the ones, Mr. Speaker, that have been carried over, of course, which would ordinarily repeat if any day were given for the call of the calendar?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, the bills would have to be passed by unanimous consent, as the gentleman knows.

As to a suspension of the rules, may I advise the gentleman that the Speaker would not recognize any Member to call up a bill under a suspension of the rules procedure without consulting with the Republican leadership.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. HALL. I do not yield at this moment, Mr. Speaker.

Continuing to reserve the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader please advise the Members of the House if it is his intention according to the rules of the House, to fix a date certain, under which suspensions may be brought up in the remaining 6 days of the Congress.

Mr. ALBERT. It is very difficult to do that, and we would have to pass the adjournment resolution in advance. We do not have the idea of doing that at this stage.

We would like to get these matters out. To be frank, I cannot bind anyone on what suspensions may be requested, but the only one I know anything about at the present time is on the bill relating to veterans' pensions.

Mr. HALL. Is it not true, I ask the majority leader, as to these individual bills, since there are so few, that they could be brought up either under that rule as far as suspensions are concerned, or the Private and Consent Calendar bills by individual unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. ALBERT. Well, I suppose they could, but this is a much better way to do it. May I say that a distinguished Member on this side of the aisle asked that we make the request as far as the Private Calendar is concerned.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It is my understanding that on the suspension request only those suspensions that have been cleared on both sides of the aisle will be called up for suspension, and not just consultation, but they will be cleared on both sides.

Mr. ALBERT. That is my understanding.

Mr. HALL. The majority leader already said that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, is it not possible to divide this request? It is my understanding that the gentleman was asking for permission to consider the Consent and Private Calendars and suspensions on Friday.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not possible to divide this request? I would be constrained to object to unlimited suspensions without knowing the bills.

Mr. ALBERT. There will not be unlimited suspensions. Any suspension that is put down will be put down in advance and will be cleared with the minority.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, if the gentleman will yield further, this advance notice—

Mr. ALBERT. I have all of the confidence in the world in the minority leader, and I am sure that the gentleman has an equal amount of confidence.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is speaking of advance notice on these bills. We

just completed action on a supplemental appropriation bill. I could not get a copy of that bill this morning as late as 9:30. I could not get a copy of the report on the bill. I understand the hearings were not released until this morning. It is impossible to deal with an appropriation bill involving some \$2 billion without far more knowledge of what you are doing. That is almost no advance notice on a bill of such magnitude.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in the present form of the unanimous consent request, I object.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CALL PRIVATE AND CONSENT CALENDARS ON FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Friday next to call the Private and Consent Calendars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER VETERANS BILL (H.R. 12555) UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES ON FRIDAY, DECEMBER 15

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Friday next for the Speaker to recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], to call the veterans bill (H.R. 12555) under suspension of the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on the supplemental appropriation bill just passed all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2171 UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill S. 2171, amendment of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, have until midnight tonight to file a conference report for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1038)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That section 2 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 is amended by adding immediately after paragraph (15) the following new paragraph:

"(16) The findings of fact contained in paragraphs (1) through (15) of this section are reiterated. Recent court decisions involving the registration provisions of this Act make it necessary to enact legislation to accomplish the purposes of such Act without the requirements of registration. Disclosure of Communist organizations and of the members of Communist-action organizations as provided in this Act is essential to the protection of the national welfare."

"Sec. 2. (a) Paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 3 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(3) The term 'Communist-action organization' means any organization in the United States (other than a diplomatic representative or mission of a foreign government accredited as such by the Department of State) which (i) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title, and (ii) operates primarily to advance the objectives of such world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title.

"(4) The term 'Communist-front organization' means any organization in the United States (other than a Communist-action organization as defined in paragraph (3) of this section) which (A) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by a Communist-action organization, or (B) is substantially directed, dominated, or controlled by one or more members of a Communist-action organization, and (C) is primarily operated for the purpose of giving aid and support to a Communist-action organization, a Communist foreign government, or the world Communist movement referred to in section 2 of this title."

"(b) Paragraph (12) of section 3 is amended by inserting 'or 13A' immediately after 'section 13'.

"Sec. 3. Subsection (f) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking the last sentence.

"Sec. 4. Section 5(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. (a) When there is in effect a final order of the Board determining any organization to be a Communist-action organization or a Communist-front organization, it shall be unlawful—

"(1) For any member of such organization, with the knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—

"(A) in seeking, accepting, or holding any nonelective office or employment under the United States, to conceal or fail to disclose the fact that he is a member of such organization; or

"(B) to hold any nonelective office or employment under the United States; or

"(C) in seeking, accepting, or holding employment in any defense facility, to conceal or fail to disclose the fact that he is a member of such organization; or

"(D) if such organization is a Communist-action organization, to engage in any employment in any defense facility; or

"(E) to hold office or employment with any labor organization, as that term is defined in section 2(5) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended (29 U.S.C. 152), or to represent any employer in any matter or proceeding arising or pending under that Act.

"(2) For any officer or employee of the United States or of any defense facility, with knowledge or notice of such final order of the Board—

"(A) to contribute funds or services to such organization; or

"(B) to advise, counsel or urge any person, with knowledge or notice that such person is a member of such organization, to perform, or to omit to perform, any act if such act or omission would constitute a violation of any provision of paragraph (1) of this subsection."

"Sec. 5. Sections 7 and 8 of such Act are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 6. Section 9 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"RECORDS OF FINAL ORDERS OF THE BOARD; PUBLIC INSPECTION; REPORTS TO PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

"Sec. 9. (a) The Board shall keep and maintain records, which shall be open to public inspection, giving the names and addresses of all organizations as to which, and individuals as to whom, there are in effect final orders of the Board issued pursuant to any of the provisions of subsections (g) through (j), inclusive, of section 13, or subsection (f) of section 13A.

"(b) Copies of all public proceedings and hearings before the Board, including the reports and orders of the Board, shall be furnished by the Board to any person upon request and upon the payment of the reasonable costs thereof as then currently fixed by the Board.

"(c) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress on or before June 1 of each year (and at any other time when requested by either House by resolution) a report giving the names and addresses of all Communist-action, Communist-front, or Communist-infiltrated organizations as to which, and all individual members of Communist-action organizations as to whom, there are in effect such final orders of the Board."

"Sec. 7. Section 10 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"USE OF THE MAILS AND INSTRUMENTALITIES OF INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

"Sec. 10. It shall be unlawful for any organization with respect to which there is in effect a final order of the Board determining it to be a Communist organization as defined in paragraph (5) of section 3 of this title, or for any person with knowledge or notice of such final order acting for or on behalf of any such organization—

"(1) to transmit or cause to be transmitted, through the United States mails or by any means or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, any publication which is intended to be, or which it is reasonable to believe is intended to be, circulated or disseminated among two or more persons, unless such publication, and any envelope, wrapper, or other container in which it is mailed or otherwise circulated or transmitted, bears the following, printed in such manner as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Attorney General: "Disseminated by _____," (with the name of the organization in lieu of the blank) "an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist-_____ organization" (setting forth in lieu of the blank whether action, front, or infiltrated, as the case may be); or

"(2) to broadcast or cause to be broadcast any matter over any radio or television station in the United States, unless such matter is preceded by the following statement: "The following program is sponsored by _____," (with the name of the organization in lieu of the blank) "an organization determined by final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board to be a Communist-_____ organization" (setting forth in lieu of the blank whether action, front, or infiltrated, as the case may be); or

"(3) to use the United States mails or any means, facility, or instrumentality of interstate or foreign commerce, including but not limited to radio and television broadcasts, to solicit any money, property, thing, or service, unless such solicitation if made orally is preceded by the following statement, and if

Dec 13, 1967

- 3 -

15. RECREATION. Rep. Edmondson criticized the testimony of Acting Bureau of Outdoor Recreation Director Stevens that "outdoor recreational opportunity" should be available to all without charge' within the cities" while "in the same testimony the Director defended vigorously a policy of entrance fees on Federal outdoor recreation areas...in the rural areas." p. H16844
16. OPINION POLL. Rep. Randall inserted the results of a questionnaire including items of interest to this Department. p. H16932
17. AGING. Rep. Laird spoke in support of "the need for calling a White House Conference on Aging" to be held in 1970. pp. H16941-2
18. ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK. Rep. Halpern spoke in support of proposed "U. S. participation in the special funds program of the Asian Development Bank." pp. H16942-3
19. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. At the request of Rep. Albert permission was granted for the remainder of the week to suspend the rules and consider conference reports on the same day reported, the three of the reports to be considered being on the foreign aid appropriation bill, the elementary and secondary education bill and the supplemental appropriation bill. p. H16895

(The proceedings of the House of Dec. 13 will be continued in the next issue of the Record.)

SENATE

20. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 14397, the supplemental appropriation bill (S. Rept. 938). p. S18495
21. SOCIAL SECURITY. Began debate on the conference report on H. R. 12080, the social security bill. pp. S18519-20, S18607-31
22. AIR POLLUTION. The District of Columbia Committee reported with amendment S. 1941, to create a D. C. Air Pollution Control Board (S. Rept. 941). p. S18496
23. GRAIN RESERVES. Sen. Hansen spoke in opposition to H. R. 12067, to authorize the CCC to establish and maintain reserve stocks of wheat, feed grains, and soybeans. pp. S18526-7
24. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Muskie criticized power rates charged by private power companies and inserted a speech by Sen. Metcalf on this subject. pp. S18503-5
25. GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS. Sen. McClellan inserted a summary of the activities of the Government Operations Committee during the 1st session of the 90th Congress. pp. S18506-10
26. LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS. Sens. Smathers and Randolph inserted a speech by President Johnson which, "eloquently summed up the record of solid Democratic accomplishments during the past 4 years." pp. S18511-2, S18532-3

Sens. Mansfield and Dirksen inserted the majority and minority reports on legislative accomplishments during the 1st session of the 90th Congress (S. Documents 60 and 61). pp. S18588-607

27. FARM ECONOMY. Sen. Talmadge commended the work of the Cotton Producers Association and inserted an article praising the President of this organization. pp. S18522-4
28. RADIATION CONTROL. Sen. Bartlett spoke in favor of S. 2067, the proposed Radiation Control for Health and Safety Act of 1967, and inserted testimony in support of this measure. pp. S18533-46
29. ECONOMY; TAXATION. Sen. Proxmire disagreed with the proposed tax increase and inserted several articles on this subject. pp. S18566-74
30. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Proxmire inserted a speech by Sen. Nelson on the expansion of foreign trade. pp. S18574-5
31. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Moss urged improvement and expansion of water resource development projects in the Upper Colorado River Basin, and inserted several articles on this subject. pp. S18576-86
32. COTTON. Sen. Murphy was added as a cosponsor to S. 1975, to prohibit importation of extra long staple cotton from countries severing relations with the U. S. p. S18499
33. POVERTY. Sens. Nelson, Moss, and Randolph commended certain projects under the anti-poverty program. pp. S18510-1, S18522, S18546-7

BILLS INTRODUCED

34. MEAT IMPORTS. H. Con. Res. 598 by Rep. Langen, H. Con. Res. 599 by Rep. Andrews, N. Dak. and others, H. Con. Res. 600 by Rep. Burton, Utah and H. Con. Res. 601 by Rep. Shriver and others, expressing the sense of the Congress that certain meat imports be prohibited until the exporting country satisfies the President that no livestock in such country is infected with hoof-and-mouth disease; to Ways and Means Committee. Remarks of Rep. Langen, p. H16908
35. GRAIN RESERVES. H. R. 14436 by Rep. Railsback, to establish producer owned and controlled emergency reserves of wheat, feed grains, and soybeans; to Agriculture Committee.
36. TAXATION. H. R. 14439 by Rep. Tunney, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to Ways and Means Committee.
37. WATER RESOURCES. H. R. 14447 by Rep. Price, Texas, to provide for an investigation and study of the feasibility of diverting water from the Missouri River to the western part of the State of Texas; to Public Works Committee.
38. CENSUS. H. R. 14431 by Rep. Teague, Calif., to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Calendar No. 924

90TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

{ REPORT
No. 938

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968

DECEMBER 13, 1967.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 14397]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 14397) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bill as passed by House.....	\$1, 679, 436, 500
Amount of increase by Senate committee.....	398, 073, 809
Amount of bill as reported to Senate.....	2, 077, 510, 309
Total estimates considered by the Senate.....	2, 120, 785, 000
Under budget estimates.....	43, 274, 691

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

Chapter	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
I	Independent offices-----	\$60, 785, 000	\$54, 706, 500	\$64, 985, 000	+\$4, 200, 000	+\$10, 278, 500
II	Department of the Interior-----	-----	12, 200, 000	12, 200, 000	+\$12, 200, 000	-----
III	Office of Economic Opportunity-----	2, 060, 000, 000	1, 612, 500, 000	1, 980, 000, 000	-\$80, 000, 000	+\$367, 500, 000
IV	Legislative branch-----	-----	30, 000	3, 078, 040	+\$3, 078, 040	+\$3, 048, 040
V	Claims and judgments-----	-----	-----	17, 247, 269	+\$17, 247, 269	+\$17, 247, 269
	Grand total-----	2, 120, 785, 000	1, 679, 436, 500	2, 077, 510, 309	-\$43, 274, 691	+\$398, 073, 809

CHAPTER I

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1967-----	\$1, 100, 000
1968 estimate-----	785, 000
House allowance-----	706, 500
Committee recommendation-----	785, 000

Restoration of \$78,500 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full amount of the budget estimate of \$785,000 for salaries and expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission, to cover the expenses of the Federal Cochairman and his staff and the Federal share of the cost of supporting staff. The Committee is advised that a large portion of the matching funds from the States involved has already been paid into the trust fund.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Appropriations for 1965, 1966, and 1967 to Agriculture, Commerce, Corps of Engineers, Health, Education and Welfare, and Interior totaled-----	\$164, 630, 000
Authorization in Public Law 90-103 for 1968 and 1969-----	170, 000, 000
1968 budget estimate-----	¹ 60, 000, 000
House allowance-----	54, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	64, 200, 000

¹ Excludes \$4,200,000 previously considered as budget estimates in other appropriation bills.

Restoration of \$10,200,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full amount of the original budget estimate of \$64,200,000 for the Appalachian regional development programs, now funded through appropriation to the President and distributed to projects approved by the Commission.

The committee agrees with the House that inadequate housing, lack of education and illiteracy are all matters of urgency which are being attacked in this program; that the third year funding of the Appalachian program here provided is directed to meeting these problems, alleviating rural poverty, and developing the region; and that the program, although in its incipiency, has shown that it can make a major contribution in meeting these challenges.

The highway portion of the program was previously funded in the regular bill at \$70 million instead of the budget estimate of \$100 million.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1968-----	\$7, 500, 000
Supplemental request-----	¹ 13, 482, 000
House allowance-----	10, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	10, 000, 000

¹ Included in H. Doc. 15, pt. 1, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$10 million, the same as the allowance of the House of Representatives and \$3,482,000 less than the budget estimate. The amount recommended is within the authorized appropriation ceiling which was increased by Public Law 90-30, June 24, 1967, after passage of the fiscal year 1968 appropriation act.

The additional amount is necessary now in order to permit a reasonable program to be continued, and to avoid closing down projects currently underway and programed for continued funding during the remainder of fiscal year 1968.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1968-----	\$860, 000
Supplemental estimate-----	None
House allowance-----	2, 200, 000
Committee recommendation-----	2, 200, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,200,000 for studies and contract costs. These funds were not included in the fiscal year 1968 budget request because the work program was not then sufficiently developed to prepare a sound estimate of needs, and the committee was so advised at the 1968 hearings. Recently enacted legislation requires that the report of the Commission be submitted to the President and to the Congress by June 30, 1970, and that the Commission shall cease to exist at the end of that year.

CHAPTER III

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

1967 appropriation-----	\$1, 687, 500, 000
1968 budget estimate-----	2, 060, 000, 000
1968 authorization-----	1, 980, 000, 000
House allowance-----	1, 612, 500, 000
Committee recommendation-----	1, 980, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,980 million, the full amount authorized, an increase of \$367,500,000 over the House allowance and \$292,500,000 over the 1967 appropriation, and a decrease of \$80 million below the budget estimate.

The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity testified that an appropriation of \$1,788 million for fiscal year 1968 will be necessary to maintain current programs at the 1967 level. He further stated that an appropriation of \$1,788 million will not provide funds for the following:

Special summer programs: \$75 million supplemental appropriation for 1967.

Headstart-Followthrough: \$120 million budget estimate.

Emergency food and medical services: \$25 million authorization.

Rural and urban slum impact programs: \$60 million authorization.

Small business technical aid: \$10 million authorization.

Day Care: \$25 million authorization.

The committee figure of \$1,980 million is to be distributed by program in accordance with the authorization act.

The committee strongly suggests that at the earliest possible date, and whenever feasible, the scattered areas being served by large, single-purpose statewide Headstart operations be converted into the several local community, or area, biracial community action program operations.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is directed to examine, re-examine and keep its programs under constant evaluation with a view toward weeding out programs that are inefficient and replacing them with either proven or new programs which are more promising. The committee strongly feels that much greater concentration can be directed toward the worst areas of poverty. The committee is to be kept informed.

CHAPTER IV

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The committee recommends the inclusion of language in the bill, which will fix the compensation of the Assistant Reporter of Debates at not to exceed \$17,860 gross per annum. The purpose of this language is to give the Secretary of the Senate necessary discretion in the initial compensation paid to any future appointee to the position of Assistant Reporter of Debates.

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

The committee recommends the inclusion of language in the bill which will increase the clerk-hire allowance of each Senator from the State of Indiana and each Senator from the State of New Jersey. These increases have been made by the committee in view of the increase in the population of these States, Indiana moving into the population-size category of 5 and 6 million, and New Jersey moving into the population-size category of 7 and 8 million. No funds have been included in the bill for this purpose since it is expected that there are sufficient funds available in this account at the present time.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

FOLDING DOCUMENTS

For the appropriation, "Folding documents," the committee recommends the amount of \$8,000 for additional funds to finance the activities of the Service Department, made necessary by the late adjournment of the Congress. The committee was informed that the workload in the Department has been exceedingly heavy during the past months, and it is anticipated that it will increase markedly early in the next calendar year.

POSTAGE STAMPS

The increased postage rate bill, recently approved by the Congress, increases the airmail postage rate from 8 cents to 10 cents. The current allowances for airmail and special delivery stamps are \$800 for Senators from States east of the Mississippi and \$1,000 for Senators from States west of the Mississippi. In order to provide for this increased rate, it will be necessary to raise the respective allowances to \$960 and \$1,200 a year. The committee, therefore, recommends the additional sum of \$9,040 to cover this increased cost for the remainder of the fiscal year.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL

The committee concurs in the allowance of the House of Representatives for \$135,000, by transfer, for necessary emergency repair work on the west central front of the Capitol, which has shown increasing signs of deterioration. The Committee for the Extension of the Capitol, after receipt of an engineering report, has approved the following work on the west front:

- (1) Putting temporary posts of heavy timbers under the remaining unsupported architrave stones of the portico;
- (2) Installing additional shoring and bracing to the old Senate and House sections; and
- (3) Repointing joints, filling cracks, and repainting the stone masonry to protect it against weathering, and establishing points for observation of movement of the structure and recording the location of same.

The funds allowed will make it possible for the repair work to begin in the spring of 1968.

SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For Senate Office Buildings, the committee recommends a total of \$231,000, as follows: \$123,000 for changes and improvements in the telephone exchange, New Senate Office Building; \$83,000 for remodeling a portion of the vacated telephone exchange; and \$25,000 to provide a special room for a magnetic tape addressing system in the New Senate Office Building.

The first two items result from the installation of the new Centrex telephone system. Temporary facilities required for the initial switching to this new system have been provided from available funds but permanent changes and improvements will be financed by this appropriation. In addition, the area in the New Senate Office Building formerly required for the telephone exchange will be greatly reduced, and it has been estimated that this vacated space can be remodeled into 13 rooms for the use of Senators and their staffs. Under a remodeling plan approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, the following areas would be provided:

One Senator's suite consisting of five rooms;

One Senator's suite consisting of six rooms; and

Two connecting odd rooms, to be assigned to the same use.

The committee was informed that this work would begin next spring upon completion of the primary work in the telephone exchange, mentioned above.

The \$25,000 allowed will provide for preparation of a special room to house a new system, which has been approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, for addressing high-volume mail for Members of the Senate. The equipment for this purpose must be housed in space which provides independently controlled temperature and humidity and is dust free. Shock-free flooring, extensive acoustical treatment, and independent electrical circuitry are also required.

PAY OF SUPERINTENDENT OF THE SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Under the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966, the salary of the Superintendent of the Senate Office Buildings was established at a base rate of \$7,700 per annum. That base yields a gross annual compensation of \$21,231. That gross would be increased by 4½ percent, or \$955, in the pay bill recently approved by the Congress, to a total of \$22,186.

In the pay bill (H.R. 7977), the base pay of five other key employees of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Superintendent of the House Office Buildings) was increased from \$7,700 to \$8,200 per annum. No change, however, was made in the base pay of the Superintendent of the Senate Office Buildings, who is currently receiving the same pay as these five employees.

In order to correct this discrepancy, the committee recommends the inclusion of the following provision:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The second paragraph under the heading "Senate Office Buildings" in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966 (79 Stat. 1147), is amended by striking out "\$7,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,200".

This change, together with the 4½ percent provided under the pay bill, would yield a gross salary of \$23,634 per annum, the same as that of the Superintendent of the House Office Buildings.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the Architect of the Capitol recommend this increase in salary for the Superintendent of the Senate Office Buildings.

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL BUILDING

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,800,000 for preparation of final plans for a new building for the Library.

Testimony before the committee established that the Library of Congress is now authorized to spend more than \$880,000 annually for rented space outside the two library buildings and that this expenditure of public funds could be stopped upon occupancy of the

new building. The committee was advised further that the cost of constructing the new building is escalating at the rate of over \$2 million a year. Thus for each year of delay in beginning the final planning and construction, a total of more than \$2,880,000 is being lost with no tangible return except the temporary space being provided for the Library in widely dispersed locations.

Under these circumstances and in view of the well established, urgent need for the building, the committee considers the appropriation of \$2.8 million at this time an exercise of prudent judgment.

CHAPTER V

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$17,247,269 to pay a number of Indian Claims Commission awards which have been finalized. This money is due the Indians concerned, and is needed to pay expenses incurred in prosecution of the claims and incident to determining distribution of the awards.

CHAPTER VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SECTION 602

The committee recommends a provision which will give the Corps of Engineers the necessary authority to proceed with sponsorship of construction of the airport at Kelley Flats, Mont. This airport project would be utilizing funds for the Corps of Engineers, local interests, and the Federal Aviation Administration, providing a permanent facility benefiting all interests.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

9

Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
				Budget estimate	House bill
CHAPTER I					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses-----	\$785, 000	\$706, 500	\$785, 000	-----	+ \$78, 500
Appalachian regional development programs-----	1 60, 000, 000	54, 000, 000	64, 200, 000	2 + \$4, 200, 000	+ 10, 200, 000
Total chapter I-----	60, 785, 000	54, 706, 500	64, 985, 000	+ 4, 200, 000	+ 10, 278, 500
CHAPTER II					
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER					
Salaries and expenses-----	(13, 482, 000)	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	+ 10, 000, 000	-----
PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses-----	-----	2, 200, 000	2, 200, 000	+ 2, 200, 000	-----
Total chapter II-----	-----	12, 200, 000	12, 200, 000	+ 12, 200, 000	-----
CHAPTER III					
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY					
Economic opportunity program-----	2, 060, 000, 000	1, 612, 500, 000	1, 980, 000, 000	— 80, 000, 000	+ 367, 500, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 10.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
				Budget estimate	House bill
CHAPTER IV					
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
SENATE					
Contingent expenses of the Senate:					
Folding documents-----			\$8, 000	+ \$8, 000	+ \$8, 000
Postage-----			9, 040	+ 9, 040	+ 9, 040
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
Gratuity to widow of deceased member-----		\$30, 000	30, 000	+ 30, 000	-----
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Capitol buildings and grounds:					
Extension of the Capitol (by transfer)-----		³ (135, 000)	³ (135, 000)	-----	-----
Senate Office Buildings-----			231, 000	+ 231, 000	+ 231, 000
Library buildings and grounds, Library of Congress: James Madison Memorial Building-----			2, 800, 000	+ 2, 800, 000	+ 2, 800, 000
Total chapter IV-----		30, 000	3, 078, 040	+ 3, 078, 040	+ 3, 048, 040
CHAPTER V					
Claims and judgments-----			17, 247, 269	+ 17, 247, 269	+ 17, 247, 269
Grand total-----	\$2, 120, 785, 000	1, 679, 436, 500	2, 077, 510, 309	— 43, 274, 691	+ 398, 073, 809

¹ Excludes \$1,200,000 requested but previously carried as a budget estimate in other appropriation bills.

² Increase of \$4,200,000 was shown as a decrease in other appropriation bills in this session of Congress.

³ To be derived by transfer from "Expansion of facilities, Capitol Power Plant."

Calendar No. 924

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 14397

[Report No. 938]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

DECEMBER 13, 1967

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

DECEMBER 13, 1967

Reported by Mr. PASTORE, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supple-
5 mental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the “Sup-
6 plemental Appropriation Act, 1968”) for the fiscal year
7 ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, namely:

1 CHAPTER I
2 INDEPENDENT OFFICES
3 APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION
4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses of the Federal Cochairman and
6 his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and
7 for payment of the Federal share of the administrative ex-
8 penses of the Commission, including services as authorized
9 by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles,
10 ~~\$706,500~~ \$785,000.

11 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
12 APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

13 For expenses necessary to carry out the programs
14 authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act
15 of 1965, as amended, except expenses authorized by section
16 105 and section 201 of said Act, including services as author-
17 ized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles,
18 ~~\$54,000,000~~ \$64,200,000, to remain available until ex-
19 pended.

20 CHAPTER II
21 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
22 OFFICE OF SALINE WATER
23 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

24 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses".
25 \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
\$2,200,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER III

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the
Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452, ap-
proved August 20, 1964), as amended, ~~\$4,642,500,000~~
~~\$1,980,000,000~~, of which not more than \$500,000 shall be
available for transfer to the Department of Agriculture to
enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the pur-
poses of Public Law 90-95, plus reimbursements: *Provided*,
That this appropriation shall be available for transfers to
the economic opportunity loan fund for loans under title
III, and amounts so transferred shall remain available until
expended: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall
be available for the purchase and hire of passenger motor
vehicles, and for construction, alteration, and repair of
buildings and other facilities, as authorized by section 602
of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for purchase
of real property for training centers: *Provided further*, That
this appropriation shall not be available for contracts under

1 titles I, II, V, VI, and VIII extending for more than
2 twenty-four months: *Provided further*, That no part of
3 the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available
4 for any grant until the Director has determined that the
5 grantee is qualified to administer the funds and programs
6 involved in the proposed grant: *Provided further*, That all
7 grant agreements shall provide that the General Accounting
8 Office shall have access to the records of the grantee which
9 bear exclusively upon the Federal grant.

10 CHAPTER IV

11 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

12 SENATE

13 SALARIES OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

14 ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO

15 SENATORS

16 *Effective January 1, 1968, the clerk hire allowance of*
17 *each Senator from the State of Indiana shall be increased*
18 *to that allowed Senators from States having a population*
19 *of five million, the population of said State having exceeded*
20 *five million inhabitants; and that the clerk hire allowance*
21 *of each Senator from the State of New Jersey shall be*
22 *increased to that allowed Senators from States having a*
23 *population of seven million, the population of said State*
24 *having exceeded seven million inhabitants.*

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Effective January 1, 1968, the Secretary may fix the compensation of the assistant reporter of debates at not to exceed \$17,860 gross per annum.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

FOLDING DOCUMENTS

For an additional amount for "Folding Documents", \$8,000.

POSTAGE STAMPS

For an additional amount for airmail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, \$9,040: Provided, That the President of the Senate and each Senator from a State east of the Mississippi River shall be allowed an additional \$80, and each Senator from a State west of the Mississippi River shall be allowed an additional \$100.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Norma W. Younger, widow of J. Arthur Younger, late a Representative from the State of California, \$30,000.

None of the funds available to the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1968 shall hereafter be available for the purposes of House Resolution 416 of the Eighty-ninth Congress relating to the hire of student congressional interns.

1 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

2 *CAPITOL BUILDINGS*

3 For an additional amount for “Extension of the Capitol”,
 4 \$135,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived
 5 by transfer from the appropriation for “Expansion of
 6 facilities, Capitol Power Plant”.

7 *SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS*

8 *For an additional amount for “Senate Office Buildings”,*
 9 *\$231,000, to remain available until expended.*

10 *LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS*11 *LIBRARY OF CONGRESS JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL*12 *BUILDING*

13 *For an additional amount for “Library of Congress*
 14 *James Madison Memorial Building”, \$2,800,000. to remain*
 15 *available until expended.*

16 *ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION*

17 *The second paragraph under the heading “Senate Office*
 18 *Buildings” in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966*
 19 *(79 Stat. 1147), is amended by striking out “\$7,700” and*
 20 *inserting in lieu thereof “\$8,200”.*

21 *CHAPTER V—CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS*

22 *For payment of Indian Claims Commission awards in*
 23 *Indian Claims Commission Docket numbered 220, awarded*
 24 *February 14, 1967; in Docket numbered 314-E, awarded*
 25 *July 18, 1967; in Dockets numbered 142, 359, 360, 361,*

1 362, and 363 (excluding the general accounting claim
 2 denominated "Second Claim" in the first amended petition
 3 in Docket numbered 363), awarded July 25, 1967; in
 4 Dockets numbered 177, 181A, and 181B, awarded Sep-
 5 tember 7, 1967; and in Docket numbered 316, awarded
 6 September 29, 1967, \$17,247,269, together with such amounts
 7 as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified
 8 in said claims or provided by law): Provided, That no
 9 award herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall
 10 become final and conclusive against the United States by
 11 failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: Provided fur-
 12 ther, That unless otherwise specifically required by law,
 13 payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall
 14 not continue for more than thirty days after the date of
 15 approval of this Act.

16 CHAPTER V VI

17 GENERAL ~~PROVISION~~ PROVISIONS

18 SEC. ~~504~~ 601. No part of any appropriation contained
 19 in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the
 20 current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

21 SEC. 602. Funds heretofore appropriated to the Depart-
 22 ment of the Army for the Libby Dam and Reservoir project
 23 in Montana may be used in an amount not to exceed \$140,-
 24 000 in participation with local interests and the Federal Air-
 25 tion Administration for the construction of an airport facility

- 1 *at Kelley Flats, Montana, in a manner deemed appropriate by*
- 2 *the Chief of Engineers.*

Passed the House of Representatives December 12,
1967.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 924

90TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 14397

[Report No. 938]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the
fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for
other purposes.

DECEMBER 13, 1967

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

DECEMBER 13, 1967

Reported with amendments

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued December 15, 1967
For actions of December 14, 1967
90th-1st; No. 205

CONTENTS

Air pollution.....9	Foreign trade.....34	Resource
Appalachia.....1,16	Interest rates.....31	development.....13,24,32
Appropriations.....1,16,16	Lands.....19,20	Retirement.....4
Banking.....34	Legislative	Rural development..7,13,24
Budget.....6,28	accomplishments....10,21	Rural housing.....22
Cotton.....14	Legislative	Saline water.....30
Credit unions.....29	business.....26	Social security.....2,23
Disaster loans.....14	Marketing.....36	Spending.....15,24
Economy.....8	Meat inspection.....11	Supergrades.....19
Employment.....32	Natural resources.....35	Supplemental
Farm program.....12	Personnel.....4,19	appropriations.....1,16
Firefighters.....4	Potato labeling.....3	Taxation.....8
Food.....12	Poverty.....1,16	Water resources....5,30,33
Foot-and-mouth disease..27	Recreation.....25,37	Wheat allotments.....18
Foreign aid.....16	Research.....5,17,35	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed supplemental appropriation bill. House received second conference report on foreign aid appropriation bill. House received conference report on supplemental appropriation bill. House passed bill to adjust wheat allotments.

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 68-7, as reported H. R. 14397, the supplemental appropriation bill, 1968. Agreed to the committee amendments, which included increases in the Appalachia and poverty items. Rejected, 30-46, an amendment by Sen. Williams, Del., to reduce the poverty item. Conferees were appointed in both Houses. pp. S18648-66, H17004 (See also item 16.)

2. SOCIAL SECURITY. First agreed to the conference report on H. R. 12080, the social security bill, then reconsidered, debated the matter, and agreed to vote today, Dec. 15. pp. S18645-8, S18732-42, S18747-86
 3. POTATO LABELING. The Commerce Committee reported without recommendation S. 562, to require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which grown (S. Rept. 943). p. S18667
 4. PERSONNEL; FIREFIGHTERS. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment S. 1507, to include firefighters under the law relating to retirement of Government employees engaged in hazardous occupations (S. Rept. 945). p. S18667
 5. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Hill inserted a speech by William J. Hull, "The Impending Water Resource Crisis." pp. S18704-7
Sen. Anderson spoke in favor of salt-water research in Israel. pp. S18703-4
 6. BUDGET. Sen. Proxmire commended the President on changes to be made in the budget structure for 1969. pp. S18710-11
 7. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Morton deplored the financial difficulties of Kenwood Products, Inc., a project assisted by ARA in eastern Ky. pp. S18711-13
 8. TAXATION; ECONOMY. Sen. Smathers inserted an article favoring the proposed surtax and discussing its relation to the economy. pp. S18723-4
 9. AIR POLLUTION. Passed as reported S. 1941, to provide for abatement of air pollution in D. C. pp. S18728-32
 10. LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS. Sen. Mansfield inserted a summary of this year's activity by Senate committees. pp. S18688-701
- (Additional Senate proceedings for Dec. 14 will be in the next Congressional Record.)

HOUSE - December 13 (Continued)

11. MEAT INSPECTION. Rep. Purcell praised this Department's role in passage of meat inspection legislation and stated that "The Department has heard the plea of the American consumer - and is ready to assure her that action will continue to be taken to provide her with the additional protection she deserves." p. H16971
12. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. O'Neal commended and inserted Rep. Poage's recent speech to the annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation in which he discussed the problems of food production for the future increasing population. pp. H16978-80
13. RURAL PROGRAMS. Rep. Nichols cited his congressional district in Ala., as a good example of progress being made through cooperative extension resource development programs to improve the quality of rural living. p. H16980
14. DISASTER LOANS. Rep. Nichols spoke in favor of his bill to provide additional FHA loans to cotton farmers who suffered crop loss from freeze damage. pp. H16980-2

House

15. SPENDING. Rep. Ford defended his position in voting against the continuing appropriations resolution stating that he is opposed to the choice of targets for the economy drive and commended passage of the Federal pay and postal rates increases legislation. p. H16985
16. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill (H. Rept. 1047). The conferees agreed to a compromise amount for the Appalachia program. They reported the poverty item in technical disagreement, but the House conferees stated that they "will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will have the effect of appropriating \$1,773,000,000 for the Office of Economic Opportunity instead of \$1,612,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,980,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and will add language which will provide that those provisions of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 that set mandatory funding levels for programs newly authorized therein shall not be effective during fiscal year 1968." pp. H17004-5
Received the second conference report on H. R. 13893, the foreign aid appropriation bill (H. Rept. 1046) (pp. H17129-8). Earlier in the day a motion by Rep. Shriver to recommit the first conference report to the committee was agreed to 196-185 (pp. H16997-17004).
17. RESEARCH. Passed without amendment S. 1477, to provide for annual, instead of quarterly, meetings of the National Advisory Committee established under the law that is commonly called the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. H17007
18. WHEAT ALLOTMENTS. Passed without amendment S. 1722, to permit the adjustment of wheat allotments in counties where wheat is the principal grain crop and where allotments are low in relation to cropland because of a shift prior to 1951 from wheat to alternative crops which may no longer be produced profitably due to plant disease or sustained loss of markets. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. H17007-8
19. PERSONNEL. Rep. Hall objected to Rep. Henderson's request to send to conference H. R. 1411, which includes a committee amendment to provide 129 additional positions at grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 to meet certain emergency needs of several executive agencies. p. H17006
20. LANDS. Reps. Hays, Cabell and Charles H. Wilson objected to the consideration of S. 974, to authorize the conveyance of certain lands to Glendale, Ariz., and it was stricken from the Consent Calendar. p. H17007
21. LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS. Reps. Minshall and Schadeberg reported on the activities of this session of Congress. pp. H17088-9, H17097-8
22. RURAL HOUSING. Rep. Nelsen expressed concern over announced "policy shifts" by HUD and Secretary Weaver's spelling out "the uncertain future of low-income housing for the elderly and of new rural public housing construction." p. H17095
23. SOCIAL SECURITY. Rep. Thompson, N. J., expressed opposition to the conference report on H. R. 12080, the social security bill. pp. H17103-4

Rep. Feighan stated that he is concerned over certain provisions of the social security bill. p. H16994

24. EXPENDITURES; BUDGET. Rep. Adams urged a valid set of spending priorities and stated that "...in 1967 when more than 70 percent of the American people live in cities, spending on rural programs enjoys the highest congressional priority." pp. H17108-9

Rep. Bow stated that he would continue to work for an expenditure limitation approach to budget control. pp. H17043-4

25. RECREATION. Rep. Edmondson stated the program for entrance fees at the Corps of Engineers' outdoor recreation areas has been a "dismal failure." p. H16992

26. LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS. Rep. Holifield expressed his intention to introduce a bill which would "prohibit consideration of any legislative business in the House for a minimum of a 2-week period in August...and prohibit consideration of any legislative business in the House for a period of at least 30 days before the presidential election of November 5." p. H16994

27. FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE. Rep. Berry stated prohibiting importation of meats and livestock from any country where foot-and-mouth disease is known to exist is not "sufficient" protection. He contended that the burden of proof "that they are clean and free from the disease...should be placed upon the exporting country...if they wish to export into this country." pp. H17025-6

28. BUDGET. Rep. Widnall commended the administration's announcement that "it was accepting all of the recommendations of the President's Commission on Budget Concepts, starting with next year's budget." pp. H17027-8

29. CREDIT UNIONS. Rep. Patman praised the work of the credit unions and inserted the remarks of the President at the signing of the omnibus credit union bill. pp. H17028-9

BILLS INTRODUCED

30. SALINE WATER. H. R. 14487 and H. R. 14488 by Rep. Saylor, to amend the Saline Water Conservation Act as it relates to foreign activities; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

31. INTEREST RATES. H. Res. 1006 by Rep. Patman and others and H. Res. 1007 by Rep. Barrett and others, to bring about lower interest rates; to Rules Committee. Remarks of Rep. Patman, p. H17017

32. EMPLOYMENT. H. R. 14479 by Rep. Edmondson, to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas; to Ways and Means Committee.

H. R. 14492 by Rep. Conyers and others, to assure to every American a full opportunity to have adequate employment, housing, and education, free from any discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin; to Education and Labor Committee. Remarks of Rep. Conyers, pp. H17090-3

33. WATER. S. 2779 by Sen. Tower, to provide for an investigation and study of the feasibility of diverting water from the Missouri River to the western part of the State of Texas; to Public Works Committee. Remarks of author pp. S18667-8

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

DECEMBER 14, 1967.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MAHON, from the committee of conference
submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 14397]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14397) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 13, 15, 16, and 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$745,750; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$56,700,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, and 19.

GEORGE MAHON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
FRANK T. BOW,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
ODIN LANGEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14397) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Amendment No. 1.—Appropriates \$745,750 for salaries and expenses of the Commission instead of \$706,500 as proposed by the House and \$785,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 2.—Appropriates \$56,700,000 for Appalachian regional development programs instead of \$54,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$64,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER III

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Amendment No. 3.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will have the effect of appropriating \$1,773,000,000 for the Office of Economic Opportunity instead of \$1,612,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,980,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and will add language which will provide that those provisions of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 that set mandatory funding levels for programs newly authorized therein shall not be effective during fiscal year 1968.

CHAPTER IV

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendments Nos. 4-11, and 14.—Reported in technical disagreement. Motions will be offered to recede and concur in these amendments, which pertain solely to housekeeping items for the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 12 and 13.—Strike out the provision in the Senate bill that would have appropriated \$2,800,000 for plans for the James Madison Memorial Library of Congress building. This action is recommended without prejudice to the merits of the project.

CHAPTER V

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

Amendment No. 15.—Strikes out the provision that would have appropriated funds for certain Indian Claims Commission awards. It is fully expected that these items will be considered and acted upon early in the next session along with other pending claims and judgments, in the first supplemental bill.

CHAPTER VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 16–18.—Correct center heading and chapter and section numbers.

Amendment No. 19.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendment making \$140,000 available for an airport at Kelley Flats, Montana, with an amendment changing the section number.

GEORGE MAHON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
FRANK T. BOW,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
ODIN LANGEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

()

\$200 million, or \$1 billion. The point is it is higher. The Senate conferees offered no new justifications to justify one additional nickel in the House bill, in my personal judgment.

The real question, however, aside from the amount, is: Where will the money come from? The money will come from the U.S. Treasury, and our Treasury is empty. There is no money. This country is in debt. The President recently said that we will be going further into debt this year to the extent of some \$35 billion. We do not have any additional money to give away here, and certainly not without justification.

That is what is so disturbing to me. It is sitting through the foreign-aid hearings and having these AID people come in and they just have no justifications to begin with. You wait until the program is done and you ask them what the program was and what it has accomplished, and they cannot tell you that. So you do not catch them on either end. I ask, then, why should we increase this bill? We have no good reason to do so, and I do not think we should. I believe we ought to recommit this bill and stand firm, particularly when the program is failing to get the job done.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

(Mr. ROONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am very unhappy as to the resolution by a majority of the conferees of many of the items contained in this conference report. Like the President of the United States, I am disturbed by the degree of reduction made in many of such items. However, I certainly believe that it would be irresponsible and unsound to recommit this conference report at this time, and I shall, therefore, vote against any such motion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further at this time to the distinguished gentlemen who seek recognition.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes back to us at a lower figure than anyone of us would have anticipated a few months ago. It is a lower figure—much lower—than anyone could have anticipated even 2 days ago. This bill is at such a low figure that the Administrator of the program is very much disturbed and upset about the action which was taken. But, we are taking this action because of the fiscal problems facing this Nation and because we think this is the course to follow at this time in the light of all the factors involved. A reduction in the foreign aid program is in the public interest, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, this reduction is much deeper than the President of the United States had anticipated. But we are confronted with the absolute need to save as many dollars as we can during this period of fiscal crisis. Moreover the reduction should improve the administration of the program.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in the conference the other body yielded about \$415 million in new obligational authority. The House conferees yielded about \$119 million in new obligational authority, which in my opinion represents an outstanding job. Regardless of how you total up the figures, the Senate receded better than two-thirds of the way to the House position.

Mr. Speaker, it disturbs me to contemplate having to go back to conference with the other body when there is no way of knowing what the outcome would be. In my opinion the vote to send this matter back to conference would represent a vote that might very well mean an increase rather than a decrease, though no one can be sure what might develop.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who say that we ought to come back from conferences with the other body with the House figure on all our bills. They fail to recognize that there are two coordinate branches of Congress with equal power and responsibility.

When we go to a conference with the other body, with millions of dollars, and perhaps billions of dollars involved, it takes a certain amount of give and take to get a conference agreement. To say that one side must prevail in every respect is to present a challenge which in most instances is not within the realm of possibility.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the subcommittee which is chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] and the full Committee on Appropriations, is entitled to appreciation for the job that has been done on this bill. I would say that the conferees on the part of the House perhaps came as near prevailing in every respect in this conference as conferees on the part of the House have ever achieved on foreign aid appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that every Member of this body, whether he is for or against foreign aid, should vote against a motion to recommit if offered. It is a dangerous motion, a motion which could not only delay the adjournment of the Congress, a situation which should not be allowed to happen, but which would bring about a confusion of the true issues involved.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would earnestly plead with both friends and enemies of the foreign aid program to vote down the motion to recommit this bill and adopt this \$414 million in savings which we have made and present here for your approval today. Let us hold to this figure which represents a sizable cut in appropriations and a real saving to the taxpayers.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the motion to recommit be voted down.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the conference report.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. SHRIVER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHRIVER moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 13893 to the committee of conference.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 196, nays 185, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 443]

YEAS—196

Abernethy	Dorn	McMillan
Adair	Dowdy	Marsh
Anderson, Ill.	Downing	May
Andrews, Ala.	Duncan	Mayne
Andrews,	Edwards, Ala.	Meskill
N. Dak.	Erlenborn	Michel
Arends	Esch	Miller, Ohio
Ashbrook	Eshleman	Minshall
Ashmore	Everett	Mize
Ayres	Evins, Tenn.	Montgomery
Baring	Findley	Moore
Battin	Fino	Mosher
Belcher	Flynt	Myers
Bell	Ford, Gerald R.	Natcher
Bennett	Fulton, Pa.	Nelsen
Berry	Galifianakis	O'Konski
Betts	Gardner	O'Neal, Ga.
Bevill	Gathings	Pelly
Biester	Goodling	Pettis
Blackburn	Gross	Pirnie
Bolton	Grover	Poff
Bow	Gubser	Pollock
Bray	Gurney	Price, Tex.
Brinkley	Hagan	Quillen
Brock	Haley	Rallsback
Brotzman	Hall	Randall
Brown, Mich.	Hammer-	Rarick
Brown, Ohio	schmidt	Reid, Ill.
Broyhill, N.C.	Hansen, Idaho	Reifel
Broyhill, Va.	Harvey	Rhodes, Ariz.
Buchanan	Henderson	Riegle
Burke, Fla.	Horton	Rogers, Fla.
Buhton, Utah	Hull	Roth
Bush	Hunt	Roudebush
Button	Hutchinson	Roush
Byrnes, Wis.	Ichord	Rumsfeld
Carter	Jarman	Ruppe
Casey	Johnson, Pa.	Sandman
Cederberg	Jonas	Satterfield
Chamberlain	Jones, N.C.	Saylor
Clancy	Keith	Schadeberg
Clausen,	Kleppe	Scherle
Don H.	Kornegay	Schneebell
Clawson, Del	Kyl	Schweiker
Cleveland	Laird	Selden
Collier	Langen	Shriver
Colmer	Latta	Skubitz
Conable	Lennon	Smith, Calif.
Corbett	Lipscomb	Smith, N.Y.
Cowger	Lloyd	Smith, Okla.
Cramer	Long, La.	Snyder
Cunningham	McClary	Springer
Curtis	McCloskey	Stanton
Davis, Ga.	McClure	Steiger, Ariz.
Davis, Wis.	McCulloch	Steiger, Wis.
Dellenback	McDade	Stephens
Denney	McDonald,	Stubblefield
Devine	Mich.	Stuckey
Dole	McEwen	Taft

Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Vander Jagt
Waggonner

Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Whalley
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall

Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Winn
Wylie
Wyman
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—185

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Burke, Mass.
Burlison
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Clark
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons

Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Herlong
Hicks
Hollifield
Holland
Howard
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kupferman
Kyros
Landrum
Leggett
Long, Md.
McCarthy
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Nedzi

Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Rickle
Pike
Poage
Pool
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Robison
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Schwengel
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Whalen
White
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolf
Wright
Wyder
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—52

Abbott
Annunzio
Bates
Bolling
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Celler
Dawson
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dwyer
Fountain
Fuqua
Griffiths
Halleck
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha

Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Hosmer
Hungate
Jones, Mo.
King, N.Y.
Kuykendall
Lukens
McFall
Macdonald,
Mass.
MacGregor
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Nichols
Reinecke
Resnick

Reuss
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rostenkowski
St. Onge
Scott
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Stratton
Talcott
Watson
Watts
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Mathias of Maryland against.

Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. McFall against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Watson for, with Mr. Reuss against.

Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Rogers of Colorado against.

Mr. Hosmer for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Sisk against.

Mr. Reinecke for, with Mr. Stratton against.

Mr. Mathias of California for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Willis with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Brown of California with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Bates.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Wyatt with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. MacGregor with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. SPRINGER, COLMER, and RAINSBACK changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 14397, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14397) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, KIRWAN, WHITTEN, EVINS of Tennessee, NATCHER, FLOOD, BOW, LAIRD, MINSHALL, and LANGEN.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14397, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 14397, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1047)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14397) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes," having met, after full

and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 13, 15, 16, and 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$745,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$56,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, and 19.

GEORGE MAHON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
FRANK T. BOW,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
ODIN LANGEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
MIKE MANSFIELD,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14397) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Appalachian Regional Commission

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$745,750 for salaries and expenses of the Commission instead of \$706,500 as proposed by the House and \$785,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Appalachian regional development program

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$56,700,000 for Appalachian regional development programs instead of \$54,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$64,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER III—OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment which will have the effect of appropriating \$1,773,000,000 for the Office of Economic Opportunity instead of \$1,612,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,980,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and will add language which will provide that those provisions of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 that set mandatory funding levels for programs newly authorized therein shall not be effective during fiscal year 1968.

CHAPTER IV—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendments Nos. 4-11, and 14: Reported in technical disagreement. Motions will be offered to recede and concur in these

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Annunzio against.

Mr. Hungate for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

ember or January, to stop the acceptance of this conference report.

So I hope, in view of the unusual situation which has developed, that the proper consideration will be given to these Senators. May I say that if it were only one Senator and I were opposed to him completely, 100 percent, I would ask for the same consideration under conditions of this sort.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor. To whom does the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator will yield to me—

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would say to the Senator that if the majority leader had made a commitment to someone who wanted to oppose the conference report that he was going to prevent this matter from coming to a vote until he or they were here to prevent it from coming to a vote, that would put this in a different light.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I made no such commitment, but I feel I have an obligation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be willing to permit a motion to reconsider to be entered. I am not willing to go beyond that point because to do so means, if we are forced to resort to a cloture motion, it would require a two-thirds vote, whereas a motion to reconsider would permit us the opportunity for debate, and we could have a vote between now and New Year's because if a motion to table were made, it would not be debatable. I have no objection to adopting that position. I do object to this bill, involving the hopes and needs of retirees and 24 million social security beneficiaries, being killed by dilatory tactics.

If the Senator would be content that we would agree that a motion to reconsider would be in order, then I would not object to such a motion being entered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say I am on the same side as the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, chairman of the committee which reported the conference report; and I would hope that, regardless of our personal feelings, we would have a chance to reconsider. I know the feelings of a number of Senators on both sides of this measure, and I appreciate their feelings, and I sympathize with all of them. But there does come a time when we do have to recognize that any individual Senator, let alone any group, no matter how small or how large, should be given the full protection of the Senate. I would hope that, regardless of our feelings, we would allow a reconsideration of the matter at this time because of the unusual situation which has developed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a motion to reconsider may be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. COTTON addressed the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there was a unanimous-consent request by the distinguished majority leader, and obviously the deputy majority leader cannot present his request until that is first acted on.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object to the first one, and I ask unanimous consent that a motion to reconsider might be in order.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I agree with the distinguished majority leader, of course, that it is the duty of every Senator to try to guard and protect the rights of every other Senator. But when the conference report was adopted on a voice vote, there were on the floor of the Senate Senators who represent the majority leadership, even thought the distinguished leader himself could not be called to the Chamber at the time. All the other officials were in the Chamber. I saw also in the Chamber, Senators who are interested in delaying, if not defeating, the adoption of the conference report. The matter was, as has been stated by the Senator from Louisiana, the subject of three voice votes.

I speak as a Senator who had intended to object and to vote against laying aside the conference report or to taking up any other business until we had acted upon the report. I speak as one who feels that after Congress has provided for many segments of the population, it would be sad and a disgrace to go home and leave the recipients of social security hanging on a thread, dependent on what might happen next year. Speaking as one who intended to make certain that action was taken, I suggest that we meet halfway the Senators who oppose the conference report.

I sat in my chair last night, prepared to sit there for an hour. But those who wish to debate and express their views against the conference report did not choose to do so, and the Senate adjourned in 10 minutes.

I certainly join the majority leader in not wanting to see any Senator deprived of his chance to be heard. But there is certainly ground for suspicion that the purpose of those Senators is, in the last hours of this session, to debate until such time as the conference report is not acted upon.

If they want unanimous consent to have the Senate rescind the action that was taken on the floor of the Senate—and certainly I would be anxious not to impinge upon their rights—then let us have a quorum call and obtain a unanimous-consent agreement that if the action by which the conference report was agreed to is rescinded, there be a limitation of debate, the time to be long enough to enable them to be heard, before we vote again. If the vote is rescinded without that kind of arrangement, it will be highly questionable, indeed, whether the Senate will have a chance to vote on the conference report.

If the Senate is to agree to rescind its action, it would seem to me to be fair that those Senators who have inadvertently lost their opportunity should first agree that there shall be some limitation on debate. I do not care whether it be 4 hours, 10 hours, a day, a day and a half, or even 2 days. But I think we should have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on this matter. If we do not, I am afraid I shall be constrained to object even to the request of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hope the Senator understands that the request I made is that a motion, which is debatable, would be in order, so that in due course, at such time as the Senate felt that there had been adequate opportunity for everyone to be heard and express his views, we could proceed to a vote.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, just a word.

First, I wish to say this: All of us have just as much interest in children under 21 as we have in our "golden agers" above 65. All of us who are interested in the elimination of the freeze are naturally for the increase in social security. I do not think any Senator, in good conscience, even though we cannot achieve our purpose of eliminating the freeze, would wish to do anything to balk or stop this very necessary increase to our elderly citizens under social security. So I say the idea of a filibuster can be banished from everyone's mind, because I do not think there will be a filibuster at all.

However, I do quite agree with my good friend from New Hampshire, who is a very reasonable man, that we ought to have some kind of an understanding here to vote at a time certain; whether it should be 5 o'clock today, 12 o'clock tomorrow, or 5 o'clock tomorrow I do not know and do not care, as long as we can obtain that assurance for anyone who even imagines there might be a filibuster in process here, so that that apprehension can be eliminated completely from our thoughts.

But I do wish to call to the attention of the leadership that it has been my unfortunate responsibility—and I use those words most advisedly—for the last 2 or 3 years, to manage both the foreign aid bill and the supplemental appropriation bill, which are usually the last two bills considered by Congress. There has been a lot of talk in the newspapers—and I hope that I might have the attention of Senators who are in private conversation; I hope I am not wasting my time—about adjournment fever.

Realizing the fact that Congress wants to adjourn sine die on Friday night, we have been working night and day, not only on the foreign aid bill but also on the poverty bill. Now we have resolved the foreign aid bill. We agreed with the House conferees yesterday afternoon, and in all probability the matter will come to the Senate for consideration either today or tomorrow.

In the meantime, we have just reported out the poverty bill. Not only do we have to go through the process of consideration on the Senate floor, we have to

meet in conference, the House has to accept the report of that conference, and then the conference report must come back to the Senate for action.

I ask only this: Let us agree on a time certain to vote on this social security bill, but at the same time allot to my committee 2 or 3 hours to resolve on the floor the poverty bill, so that we can go to conference, and then all we shall have pending before the Senate will be four reports, and I think we can all get out of here by 5 o'clock tomorrow night.

But if I am going to be required to wait here and wait here, and then, after the Senate gets through with this hassle, go through the process of bringing up the poverty bill, then go over to the House of Representatives and hold our conference, and then come back here, I announce to the Senate now that I have no intention of staying here Saturday, and if we do not get it done by Friday, we will have to go over until next week, my patience is now at a breaking point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the Senator says is correct; and, if I may have the attention of the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I ask the Senator from New Hampshire, would he withdraw his reservation or qualification if I could give him assurance—which I am giving in the utmost good faith—that the vote on the pending conference report will take place at 11 o'clock tomorrow, Friday, morning?

I make this request after discussing the matter. I think it brings this situation to a head. It will protect the rights of the Senators who are raising questions about the conference report, and I think it will meet the feelings of the great majority of the Senate, if this could be agreed to and a reconsideration brought about.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have little doubt in my mind that the distinguished majority leader would be able to fulfill his perfectly sincere assurance—but, Mr. President, I do have that little doubt. I have been here too long and seen too many recalcitrant Senators come on the floor who were not present when an assurance was given. I cannot see why the distinguished majority leader cannot make his request for a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at whatever hour he designates on Friday, and if that consent is obtained, then, of course, we can all be perfectly sure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, just to emphasize what the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has already said, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the conference report which has just been agreed to by the Senate, be reconsidered, and that another vote on the conference report take place at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before that unanimous-consent request can be considered, the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Louisiana will have to be withdrawn or acted upon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I withdraw it. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might amend my request to provide that a motion to reconsider be in order, and that if that motion to reconsider be agreed to, that the Senate agree, by unanimous consent, that we will vote on the conference report at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered; and that the vote on the adoption of the conference report occur tomorrow at 11 a.m.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That the Senate proceed to vote on the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 12080, Social Security Amendments of 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m., Friday, December 15, 1967.

(This order was subsequently modified to provide for the vote to be had at 11:30 a.m.)

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, for the record, the failure to object at the time of the passage of the conference report was my error and my mistake.

I take full responsibility for what happened. I was standing at my seat in the rear of the Chamber after the morning hour waiting to be recognized for the purpose of opposing the adoption of the conference report. It was my understanding that an agreement had been reached to take up the matter of the consideration of the supplemental appropriations before the social security conference report. Naturally, had I realized that the report being slipped through was the social security conference, I would have objected. I mistakenly assumed the majority whip was passing the supplemental appropriation which I supported.

To that extent, I think that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS] and others should be protected from any responsibility to detect this unusual tactic. Unfortunately, in this great deliberative body, at times one learns the hard way. I will be a little older and a little wiser because of the error and I will certainly use better judgment in the future in my reliance on certain traditions and customs of the Senate.

It took 30 seconds after the morning hour for the conference report to be moved through.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, when I was serving my first term, I was filibustering the Basing Point bill. The then Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, and I made a motion to reconsider when the chairman had put the motion on the conference report. And we were able to obtain agreement that we would debate the motion to reconsider which was subject to a motion to table. It was subject to a motion to reconsider, and we were in a position that we had to permit the matter to come to a vote when, as far as I was concerned, they had every intention of filibustering that bill to death.

There is nothing at all new about someone losing some of his parliamentary rights because of his failure to object or to start speaking when a measure comes before the Senate.

It has happened to me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, for the RECORD, I did not intend, nor did any of my associates, to filibuster this matter. I have a speech of some 1½ hours duration the substance of which I have delivered before, but which I had hoped to deliver again. Now that we have a unanimous-consent agreement, I hope that I will have that opportunity. I merely wanted to point out where the responsibility lay as far as the failure to object is concerned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I agreed to the unanimous-consent request in order to accommodate other Senators. I will not be here tomorrow to vote on that conference report, because I have made longstanding commitments that require me to be in Louisiana. However, to accommodate other Senators, I was willing to agree to a unanimous-consent request so that other Senators could make their speeches.

I trust the good judgment of the Senate, even though I will not be here to respond to their arguments. I am confident that the conference report will be agreed to. Everybody can make his speech and the Senate can vote on the matter tomorrow.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I made the motion to table the motion to reconsider a little while ago in the normal course of things, as we do ordinarily when a motion to reconsider is made. We normally make a motion to table that motion.

My motion to table the motion to reconsider was made as we ordinarily make it and without any thought or desire to shut off those who wish to delay action on the conference report.

The failure of the Senator from Maryland to object does not reflect any discredit on him. There was a good bit of moving about and talking in the Senate Chamber. I do not think the Senator from Maryland heard or was aware of what was taking place.

I am glad we have been able to work this matter out so that all Senators will have an opportunity to express their feeling and we will have an opportunity to get on with the work of the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the conference report on the social security bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 924, H.R. 14397, the supplemental appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14397) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum so that word will go abroad as to what we are considering.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. PASTORE. The House reported the supplemental appropriations bill, 1968 (H.R. 14397), the morning of Tuesday, December 12, and passed the bill that afternoon. The Senate subcommittee commenced taking testimony on Tuesday afternoon and concluded yesterday, December 13.

In executive session yesterday afternoon, the committee recommendations were made, as summarized in Senate Report No. 938, including explanations of all items in the bill. Briefly, these items include the provisions of \$1,980,000,000 for the Office of Economic Opportunity. The amount recommended is the total authorized in the recently approved authorization act. The House version of the bill would have provided \$1,612,500,000.

The committee recommendations also include the provision of \$64,985,000 for Appalachian regional development programs, and administrative expenses, which is the full budget estimate and \$10,278,500 above the House bill.

Other major adjustments recommended by the committee include \$2,800,000 for plans for the James Madison Memorial Building. There has also been added to the bill by the committee \$17,247,269 for claims and judgments rendered by the Indian Claims Committee. Additional items relating to the Senate amounting to \$278,040 are detailed in the report.

I ask unanimous consent that the detailed explanation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER I

Independent offices

Appalachian Regional Commission

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1967-----	\$1, 100, 000
1968 estimate-----	785, 000
House allowance-----	706, 500
Committee recommendation----	785, 000

Restoration of \$78,500 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full amount of the budget estimate of \$785,000 for salaries and expenses of the Appalachian Regional Commission, to cover the expenses of the Federal Cochairman and his staff and the Federal share of the cost of supporting staff. The Committee is advised that a large portion of the matching funds from the States involved has already been paid into the trust fund.

Funds Appropriated to the President

Appalachian regional development programs

Appropriations for 1965, 1966, and 1967 to Agriculture, Commerce, Corps of Engineers, Health, Education and Welfare, and Interior totaled -----	\$164, 630, 000
Authorization in Public Law 90-103 for 1968 and 1969---	170, 000, 000
1968 budget estimate-----	160, 000, 000
House allowance-----	54, 000, 000
Committee recommendation--	64, 200, 000

¹ Excludes \$4,200,000 previously considered as budget estimates in other appropriation bills.

Restoration of \$10,200,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full amount of the original budget estimate of \$64,200,000 for the Appalachian regional development programs, now funded through appropriation to the President and distributed to projects approved by the Commission.

The committee agrees with the House that inadequate housing, lack of education and illiteracy are all matters of urgency which are being attacked in this program; that the third year funding of the Appalachian program here provided is directed to meeting these problems, alleviating rural poverty, and developing the region; and that the program, although in its incipency, has shown that it can make a major contribution in meeting these challenges.

The highway portion of the program was previously funded in the regular bill at \$70 million instead of the budget estimate of \$100 million.

CHAPTER II

Department of the Interior

Office of Saline Water

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1968-----	\$7, 500, 000
Supplemental request-----	13, 482, 000
House allowance-----	10, 000, 000
Committee recommendation----	10, 000, 000

¹ Included in H. Doc. 15, pt. 1, 90th Cong., 1st sess., 1967.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$10 million, the same as the allowance of the House of Representatives and \$3,482,000 less than the budget estimate. The amount recommended is within the authorized appropriation ceiling which was increased by Public Law 90-30, June 24, 1967, after passage of the fiscal year 1968 appropriation act.

The additional amount is necessary now in order to permit a reasonable program to be continued, and to avoid closing down projects currently underway and programmed for continued funding during the remainder of fiscal year 1968.

Public Land Law Review Commission

Salaries and expenses

Appropriation, 1968-----	\$860, 000
Supplemental estimate-----	None
House allowance-----	2, 200, 000
Committee recommendation----	2, 200, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,200,000 for studies and contract costs. These funds were not included in the fiscal year 1968 budget request because the work program was not then sufficiently developed to prepare a sound estimate of needs, and the committee was so advised at the 1963 hearings. Recently enacted legislation requires that the report of the Commission be submitted to the President and to the Congress by June 30, 1970, and that the Commission shall cease to exist at the end of that year.

CHAPTER III

Executive Office of the President

Office of Economic Opportunity

Economic opportunity program

1967 appropriation-----	\$1, 687, 500, 000
1968 budget estimate-----	2, 060, 000, 000
1968 authorization-----	1, 980, 000, 000
House allowance-----	1, 612, 500, 000
Committee recommendation--	1, 980, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,980 million, the full amount authorized, an increase of \$367,500,000 over the 1967 appropriation, and a decrease of \$80 million below the budget estimate.

The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity testified that an appropriation of \$1,788 million for fiscal year 1968 will be necessary to maintain current programs at the 1967 level. He further stated that an appropriation of \$1,788 million will not provide funds for the following:

Special summer programs: \$75 million supplemental appropriation for 1967.

Headstart-Followthrough: \$120 million budget estimate.

Emergency food and medical services: \$25 million authorization.

Rural and urban slum impact programs: \$60 million authorization.

Small business technical aid: \$10 million authorization.

Day Care: \$25 million authorization.

The committee figure of \$1,980 million is to be distributed by program in accordance with the authorization act.

The committee strongly suggests that at the earliest possible date, and whenever feasible, the scattered areas being served by large, single-purpose statewide Headstart operations be converted into the several local community, or area, biracial community action program operations.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is directed to examine, reexamine and keep its programs under constant evaluation with a view toward weeding out programs that are inefficient and replacing them with either proven or new programs which are more promising. The committee strongly feels that much greater concentration can be directed toward the worst areas of poverty. The committee is to be kept informed.

CHAPTER IV

Legislative Branch

Senate

Salaries, officers and employees

Office of the Secretary

The committee recommends the inclusion of language in the bill, which will fix the compensation of the Assistant Reporter of Debates at not to exceed \$17,860 gross per annum. The purpose of this language is to give the Secretary of the Senate necessary discretion in the initial compensation paid

to any future appointee to the position of Assistant Reporter of Debates.

Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators

The committee recommends the inclusion of language in the bill which will increase the clerk-hire allowance of each Senator from the State of Indiana and each Senator from the State of New Jersey. These increases have been made by the committee in view of the increase in the population of these States, Indiana moving into the population-size category of 5 and 6 million, and New Jersey moving into the population-size category of 7 and 8 million. No funds have been included in the bill for this purpose since it is expected that there are sufficient funds available in this account at the present time.

Contingent Expenses of the Senate

Folding documents

For the appropriation, "Folding documents," the committee recommends the amount of \$8,000 for additional funds to finance the activities of the Service Department, made necessary by the late adjournment of the Congress. The committee was informed that the workload in the Department has been exceedingly heavy during the past months, and it is anticipated that it will increase markedly early in the next calendar year.

Postage stamps

The increased postage rate bill, recently approved by the Congress, increases the airmail postage rate from 8 cents to 10 cents. The current allowances for airmail and special delivery stamps are \$800 for Senators from States east of the Mississippi and \$1,000 for Senators from States west of the Mississippi. In order to provide for this increased rate, it will be necessary to raise the respective allowances to \$960 and \$1,200 a year. The committee, therefore, recommends the additional sum of \$9,040 to cover this increased cost for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Architect of the Capitol

Capitol Buildings and Grounds

Extension of the Capitol

The committee concurs in the allowance of the House of Representatives for \$135,000, by transfer, for necessary emergency repair work on the west central front of the Capitol, which has shown increasing signs of deterioration. The Committee for the Extension of the Capitol, after receipt of an engineering report, has approved the following work on the west front:

- (1) Putting temporary posts of heavy timbers under the remaining unsupported architrave stones of the portico;
- (2) Installing additional shoring and bracing to the old Senate and House sections;
- (3) Repointing joints, filling cracks, and repainting the stone masonry to protect it against weathering, and establishing points for observation of movement of the structure and recording the location of same.

The funds allowed will make it possible for the repair work to begin in the spring of 1968.

Senate Office Buildings

For Senate Office Buildings, the committee recommends a total of \$231,000, as follows: \$123,000 for changes and improvements in the telephone exchange, New Senate Office Building; \$83,000 for remodeling a portion of the vacated telephone exchange; and \$25,000 to provide a special room for a magnetic tape addressing system in the New Senate Office Building.

The first two items result from the installation of the new Centrex telephone system. Temporary facilities required for the initial switching to this new system have been provided from available funds but permanent changes and improvements will be financed

by this appropriation. In addition, the area in the New Senate Office Building formerly required for the telephone exchange will be greatly reduced, and it has been estimated that this vacated space can be remodeled into 13 rooms for the use of Senators and their staffs. Under a remodeling plan approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, the following areas would be provided:

One Senator's suite consisting of five rooms;

One Senator's suite consisting of six rooms; and

Two connecting odd rooms, to be assigned to the same use.

The committee was informed that this work would begin next spring upon completion of the primary work in the telephone exchange, mentioned above.

The \$25,000 allowed will provide for preparation of a special room to house a new system, which has been approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, for addressing high-volume mail for Members of the Senate. The equipment for this purpose must be housed in space which provides independently controlled temperature and humidity and is dust free. Shock-free flooring, extensive acoustical treatment, and independent electrical circuitry are also required.

Pay of Superintendent of the Senate Office Buildings

Under the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966, the salary of the Superintendent of the Senate Office Buildings was established at a base rate of \$7,700 per annum. That base yields a gross annual compensation of \$21,231. That gross would be increased by 4½ percent, or \$955, in the pay bill recently approved by the Congress, to a total of \$22,186.

In the pay bill (H.R. 7977), the base pay of five other key employees of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Superintendent of the House Office Buildings) was increased from \$7,700 to \$8,200 per annum. No change, however, was made in the base pay of the Superintendent of the Senate Office Buildings, who is currently receiving the same pay as these five employees.

In order to correct this discrepancy, the committee recommends the inclusion of the following provision:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The second paragraph under the heading "Senate Office Buildings" in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966 (79 Stat. 1147), is amended by striking out "\$7,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,200".

This change, together with the 4½ percent provided under the pay bill, would yield a gross salary of \$23,634 per annum, the same as that of the Superintendent of the House Office Buildings.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and the Architect of the Capitol recommend this increase in salary for the Superintendent of the Senate Office Buildings.

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,800,000 for preparation of final plans for a new building for the Library.

Testimony before the committee established that the Library of Congress is now authorized to spend more than \$880,000 annually for rented space outside the two library buildings and that this expenditure of public funds could be stopped upon occupancy of the new building. The committee was advised further that the cost of constructing the new building is escalating at the rate of over \$2 million a year. Thus for each year of delay in beginning the final planning and construction, a total of more

than \$2,880,000 is being lost with no tangible return except the temporary space being provided for the Library in widely dispersed locations.

Under these circumstances and in view of the well established, urgent need for the building, the committee considers the appropriation of \$2.8 million at this time an exercise of prudent judgment.

CHAPTER V

Claims and judgments

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$17,247,269 to pay a number of Indian Claims Commission awards which have been finalized. This money is due the Indians concerned, and is needed to pay expenses incurred in prosecution of the claims the incident to determining distribution of the awards.

CHAPTER VI

General provisions

Section 602

The committee recommends a provision which will give the Corps of Engineers the necessary authority to proceed with sponsorship of construction of the airport at Kelley Flats, Mont. This airport project would be utilizing funds for the Corps of Engineers, local interests, and the Federal Aviation Administration, providing a permanent facility benefiting all interests.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the bill totals \$2,077,510,309, which is \$398,073,809 over the House bill but \$43,274,691 under the budget estimates.

Mr. President, although this bill was reported by the House on Tuesday, December 12, was passed that afternoon, and we of the Senate committee began taking testimony the same afternoon and concluded yesterday, December 13, I want the Senate and the people at large to understand that all parties concerned were heard. Every item was gone into exhaustively. No one need have any fear about that. A conscientious job does not depend upon the time that is devoted to a problem. It is the quality of the devotion that counts. The members of the committee met, questions were asked, answers were given, and I am ready at this time to answer any question from anybody on anything contained in this appropriation.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc, without prejudice to any amendments being made thereto or to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 10, strike out "\$706,500" and insert "\$785,000".

On page 2, at the beginning of line 18, strike out "\$54,000,000" and insert "\$64,200,000".

On page 3, line 10, after the word "amended," strike out "\$1,612,500,000" and insert "\$1,980,000,000".

On page 4, after line 11, insert:

"SENATE

"Salaries of officers and employees

"Administrative and Clerical Assistants to Senators

"Effective January 1, 1968, the clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the State of Indiana shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of five million, the population of said State

having exceeded five million inhabitants; and that the clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the State of New Jersey shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of seven million, the population of said State having exceeded seven million inhabitants."

At the top of page 5, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Effective January 1, 1968, the Secretary may fix the compensation of the assistant reporter of debates at not to exceed \$17,860 gross per annum."

On page 5, after line 4, insert:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"Folding documents

"For an additional amount for 'Folding Documents', \$8,000."

On page 5, after line 8, insert:

"POSTAGE STAMPS

"For an additional amount for airmail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, \$9,040: *Provided*, That the President of the Senate and each Senator from a State east of the Mississippi River shall be allowed an additional \$80, and each Senator from a State west of the Mississippi River shall be allowed an additional \$100."

On page 6, after line 6, insert:

"SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

"For an additional amount for 'Senate Office Buildings', \$231,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 6, after line 9, insert:

"LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

"Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building

"For an additional amount for 'Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building', \$2,800,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 6, after line 15, insert:

"ADMINISTRATION PROVISION

"The second paragraph under the heading 'Senate Office Buildings' in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966 (79 Stat. 1147), is amended by striking out '\$7,700' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$8,200'."

On page 6, after line 20, insert:

"CHAPTER V—CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

"For payment of Indian Claims Commission awards in Indian Claims Commission Docket numbered 220, awarded February 14, 1967; in Docket numbered 314-E, awarded July 18, 1967; in Dockets numbered 142, 359, 360, 361, 362, and 363 (excluding the general accounting claim denominated 'Second Claim' in the first amended petition in Docket numbered 363), awarded July 25, 1967; in Dockets numbered 177, 181A, and 181B, awarded September 7, 1967; and in Docket numbered 316, awarded September 29, 1967, \$17,247,269, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in said claims or provided by law): *Provided*, That no award herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of this Act."

On page 7, line 16, change the chapter number from "V" to "VI".

On page 7, line 17, in the heading strike out "Provision" and insert "Provisions".

On page 7, at the beginning of line 18, change the section number from "501" to "601".

On page 7, after line 20, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 602. Funds heretofore appropriated to the Department of the Army for the Libby Dam and Reservoir project in Montana may be used in an amount not to exceed \$140,000 in participation with local interests and the Federal Aviation Administration for the construction of an airport facility at Kelley Flats, Montana, in a manner deemed appropriate by the Chief of Engineers."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the Senator from Rhode Island on a magnificent job as chairman of the subcommittee which has brought this supplemental appropriations bill to the floor.

I am almost speechless in my admiration for the sound tactics and strategy by which he brought the entire amount of the 1968 authorization of \$1,980,000,000 for the Office of Economic Opportunity through his committee and to the floor.

I note with special pleasure the comments on page 4 of the report, where it is pointed out succinctly why this entire sum is desperately needed for the poverty program. I ask unanimous consent that the discussion and the figures under the heading on page 4, "Executive Office of the President, Office of Economic Opportunity, Economic Opportunity Program," be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office of Economic Opportunity

Economic Opportunity Program

1967 appropriation-----	\$1,687,500,000
1968 budget estimate-----	2,060,000,000
1968 authorization-----	1,980,000,000
House allowance-----	1,612,500,000
Committee recommendation..	1,980,000,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,980 million, the full amount authorized, an increase of \$367,500,000 over the House allowance and \$292,500,000 over the 1967 appropriation, and a decrease of \$80 million below the budget estimate.

The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity testified that an appropriation of \$1,788 million for fiscal year 1968 will be necessary to maintain current programs at the 1967 level. He further stated that an appropriation of \$1,788 million will not provide funds for the following:

Special summer programs: \$75 million supplemental appropriation for 1967.

Headstart-Followthrough: \$120 million budget estimate.

Emergency food and medical services: \$25 million authorization.

Rural and urban slum impact programs: \$60 million authorization.

Small business technical aid: \$10 million authorization.

Day Care: \$25 million authorization.

The committee figure of \$1,980 million is to be distributed by program in accordance with the authorization act.

The committee strongly suggests that at the earliest possible date, and whenever feasible, the scattered areas being served by large, single-purpose statewide Headstart operations be converted into the several local community, or area, biracial community action program operations.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is directed to examine, reexamine and keep its programs under constant evaluation with a

view toward weeding out programs that are inefficient and replacing them with either proven or new programs which are more promising. The committee strongly feels that much greater concentration can be directed toward the worst areas of poverty. The committee is to be kept informed.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that no effort will be made to cut back the recommendation of the committee. Having had this problem as probably my own major senatorial responsibility this year, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty, and having, to the extent possible, shepherded the authorization bill through the subcommittee, the full committee, the floor, and then through conference, I can say without hesitation that every nickel of this money is desperately needed to help solve the problem of almost 30 million Americans who are living in a state of poverty at the moment.

I understand that the Senator from New York, who is a valued member of the Appropriations Committee, will engage in a colloquy with the Senator from Rhode Island with respect to some of the earmarking which appeared in the House-passed bill; and, as the chairman of the legislative committee, I should like to wish him success in his efforts.

One of the items we believed most important in the Senate committee dealing with the authorization was to hold the earmarking to an absolute minimum, and also to give as much flexibility and local authority as possible to the community action agencies across the country which, by and large, with some exceptions, are doing a fine job in carrying out the intent of Congress.

Mr. President, I close by again congratulating the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for a superb job.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief, because I believe Senator PASTORE has done an extraordinary service for our Nation. We often permit these matters to pass with the banal words "a fine job." This is an extraordinary service to the Nation, and for this reason: Senator PASTORE has convinced the Appropriations Committee of the wise course, as this problem will have to be settled in conference, the Senate should consider a poverty appropriation bill at the full amount of the authorization which was arrived at after the most considered deliberation.

Considering the time available, it is extraordinary that so much thought has gone into what was done and into the statements which are here reflected, and it is best that the matter be left now with that directive, following the authorization bill, to our chief negotiator—to wit, Senator PASTORE.

I do not intend, Mr. President, by anything I say or do, to change that basic strategy, which I believe is extremely sound and is a great credit to the Senator from Rhode Island and what makes him one of our really great Members.

Mr. President, the key issues are very well stated, and they are two: The other body, acting in that kind of twilight zone of congressional procedure, has sought to do something which is not in the authorization legislation and which, if put

in the appropriation bill, would have been subject to a point of order and to the requirement of a two-thirds vote, and so forth—to wit, earmark the funds appropriated in a way which is not reflected in the authorization bill. They have sought to do that in the report. I refer specifically to the report on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1968, as made to the other body.

Mr. President, by putting this in the report you put it beyond the reach of amendment and you put it beyond the reach of being affected in any way at all except by some other report or legislative history.

It amounts to an injunction to the administering agency that will incur the displeasure of the legislative committee in the other body, and perhaps of the other body itself for all we know, although we cannot tell as this was not susceptible to action on the floor of the House.

Our approach, as shown by the report, and this was the subject of statement of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] a few months ago, provides that the amount of money which is ultimately arrived at "is to be distributed by program in accordance with the authorization act." That means to all programs, whether they be essentially old programs such as community action or special impact or small farmers assistance or new programs such as day care.

There is also pointed out in our report what is elementary commonsense. Our committee states that the OEO should be constantly evaluating its programs and it should weed out those programs which are inefficient and replace them with new or proven programs which are more promising. There are a number of rewritten or new programs in the authorizing legislation which give the Director a range of directives.

For example, there is a meeting now in session in the conference room of the Committee on Agriculture, being presided over by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration with directors of small business development centers from the slums and ghettos all over the United States.

I had the honor to arrange for that meeting myself in which the Administrator of the Small Business Administration is seeking to develop with the directors of these small business development centers the best business assistance program for people who live in the slum areas. This program, which is a rewrite of an old program, aims at people who are able to go into business themselves and who could be helped in going into business for themselves by being given technical assistance.

This is the kind of creativity and revision which is needed in this program. There is also a great interest in the legislative committee in a bill which originated with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] to provide emergency food and medical services in the amount of \$25 million, since we had found there was starvation in some areas of the United States—which was absolutely unbelievable to us.

With the help of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the help of many other legislators of good will, we have developed an emergency approach for that problem.

I now wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], if he feels free to answer, and I know full well his views on the subject, whether he feels the kind of directive he has in our report to be the more sensible business approach, based upon an evaluation of the worth of all programs. Then, I wish to ask the Senator whether he feels the effort in the report of the other body to earmark very large sums, well over \$1 billion, is not binding on the Director of the OEO, in view of the fact that the Senate has now taken a different and, I think, far more businesslike course.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, turning to page 5 of our report, we use the following language:

The committee figure of \$1,980,000,000 is to be distributed by program in accordance with the authorization act.

This is in direct refutation of the language used in the House report.

It has been brought to my attention that, since the writing of the House report, there has been some conversation with the administration and the members of the House Committee on Appropriations—and I am not saying there is an understanding—but I think there is an inclination toward an understanding that it could do some harm.

Therefore, we, in our report, vitiated that. We will go into conference and talk about it and I do not think we will have much trouble.

The Senator is correct. If you handcuff the hands of the administration by picking out a few favorite programs, and they are good and popular programs, and say, "Here you cannot cut," and then you do make another cut so far as the overall authorization, you are going to suffocate other programs, especially this program initiated by our distinguished friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], to feed the hungry.

This is a sad paradox in our great country. We are the most affluent society in the world. Mankind has never known the affluence America enjoys today. What a sad commentary on our progress that we have 90 million people in America who live on the edge of poverty, and that we have great pockets of population in our country where children go to bed at night crying because they are hungry. One would not believe that unless he heard the testimony.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is one other point which bears exactly on this line of discussion.

Does not the Senator from Rhode Island feel that the sentence he has read—and he used exactly the right word in terms of legislative intent in saying it would vitiate what was done in the other body—is also to be read with the last paragraph which asks the Director to feel free to weed out what is not working and substitute programs that will work, and that these two provisions must be read together?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct, and that is made clear in the report. That

was the suggestion of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who is quite disturbed over the fact that sometimes we do have a program that is not going along as well as it should and not doing the work it was intended it might do. In that case I do not think we should remain steadfast. We should have the courage, good judgment, and judiciousness to stop that kind of program and get into what serves the people in the objectives of the entire program.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I point out one very key area in which that philosophy would obtain, which would please many Members here and in the other body. I refer to dealing with rural poverty. One of the major aspects we had impressed upon us was that there is enormous rural poverty. It will be noted that one of the programs which the Director is to undertake is under the heading of the rural and urban slum impact program, for which there is an authorization of \$60 million.

Finally, the committee in the other body said:

It definitely is not the intention of the committee to supplement this appropriation at a later date.

Our report does not say that. I do not contemplate nor does anyone contemplate that we yield any initiative or right to do or not to do whatever we think is deserved by a supplemental. To prevent that now after what we experienced last summer, and to say that is not to be done, is to behave like an ostrich.

Again, I must say that the wise and businesslike approach taken by our committee stands in marked contrast in this respect to what was said in the other body.

Mr. President, I do not think there is any question about the need for money. The antipoverty program is one of the most noble our country has ever undertaken. I happen to be uniquely identified with it because I am the ranking minority member on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which deals with the question legislatively, I am a member of the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Government Operations Committee, which is investigating riots and violence, and I am also a member of the Appropriations Committee which worked closely with our beloved chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

I must say that, most objectively, the approach taken by the Senate is something which is as deeply gratifying to me as anything I have encountered in all my Senate service. I attribute this most heavily to the wisdom of the members of the committee and to the outstanding leadership of its chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AIRPORT AT KELLEY FLATS, MONT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the language in this bill which applies to an airport facility at Kelley Flats, Mont., to support the Libby Dam and Reservoir project is provided to insure that the Federal Government receives the greatest tangible return from its expenditures.

The facts simply stated are as follows:

The Corps of Engineers need an airstrip at Libby Dam for survey and inspection operations, supply missions, and management control. Congress has appropriated \$132,300 toward the construction costs of this airport. For that amount, the Corps of Engineers can build an inadequate unsurfaced airport, without lights, capable of handling aircraft no larger than 16,500 pounds wheel load capacity.

This airport will be built on rented land, thus requiring additional Federal expenditures. Maintenance costs will be borne by the Corps of Engineers during its entire use and after approximately 7 years, the airport will be abandoned.

The proposed alternative is to allow the Corps of Engineers to participate with the Federal Aviation Administration and the local Montana community by expending the same \$132,300 on an airport that will meet FAA specifications. It will be longer, wider, paved, lighted, and will certainly be safer.

All operation and maintenance costs of this airport would be borne by the local people. This is estimated to cost \$10,000 per year. The Federal Government will receive free use of the facility for 100 years.

This proposal will provide a facility from which dependable scheduled air service can operate, thereby greatly reducing the ground transportation costs for Government agencies involved. This service alone will save an estimated \$200,000 during the construction of the dam, according to the Corps of Engineers. It will provide a reliable air medical evacuation facility which will greatly reduce contractor insurance costs and Government costs. I might add that Government contractors will be required to pay the usual fees and charges to use the proposed airport.

In other words, the Government can probably recoup its entire investment from savings of appropriated funds during the dam construction if it has access to a modern airport.

Under this proposal, the Corps of Engineers will contribute its \$132,300; the Federal Aviation Administration will grant 53 percent of the total final construction costs, and the local community will contribute approximately \$40,000 for construction costs, as well as assuming the responsibility for maintenance and operation of the field at a cost of \$10,000 per year.

This measure will not require the appropriation of one additional cent. An airfield will be constructed at the dam-site, and an airfield will be constructed for the community at some future date. The Federal Government will have a substantial investment in both fields. Is it not wiser to recognize that by authorizing only one airfield at this time which will effect substantial savings for the Government is far more responsible than to allow construction of an airfield which will not produce savings at the dam and which will be abandoned in less than 10 years?

If we are sincerely interested in fiscal responsibility, this language can be defended under the closest scrutiny. I submit that the drawbacks to this project

are that it is too logical, it will produce substantial savings, it will cost the Government less in the long run, it will provide a safe, modern airport which will meet FAA specifications, and it will cost less money than will be spent on a temporary dirt strip, to be abandoned later, in addition to an airport which must be built to serve this growing area.

Incidentally, the population of Libby is closer to 14,000 rather than 2,800 as was stated during the debate in the House when this was last considered several months ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, line 11, to strike out "\$1,980,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,612,500,000".

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, while a sufficient number of Senators are present, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays on passage were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall delay the Senate but a very few moments. The purpose of the amendment is to reduce the item for the Office of Economic Opportunity back to the amount approved by the House. The House allowed \$1,612,500,000. The Senate committee would increase this amount by \$367,500,000. The purpose of this amendment is to roll that figure back to the level of the House figure.

While it is true that during the course of consideration of other appropriation bills this year the appropriations have been reduced somewhat below the budget requests in many instances, nevertheless the Senate has an almost perfect score of having opposed many of these reductions. In fact, the Senate raised each appropriation bill above the amount approved by the House. I think the Senate, particularly in these late hours, has a responsibility to hold the line.

The President of the United States is suggesting that we should have a 10-percent increase in taxes in order to control inflation and to bring the fiscal position of the Government under better control. It is estimated that without a tax increase the deficit will be \$22 billion to \$24 billion. Even with a tax increase next year—and that is as soon as it can be obtained—the deficit will be \$15 billion to \$17 billion. This is an average of \$1.5

billion a month that the Government is spending more than it is taking in.

Inflation is not merely a threat in this country; inflation is a reality, as evidenced by the cost of living and the cost of any item one happens to buy. As a result of the enormous demand for money, because of the Federal Government's deficit financing of these programs, money which the Government is borrowing rather than raising from taxes, interest rates have been brought to the highest level in 100 years.

If we use the normal accounting practices which have been followed for 175 years, the record shows that in the last 5 years the Johnson administration has spent \$60 billion more than it has taken in. That is an average of \$1 billion a month, or around \$50 million a day when we put the Government on a 5-day work-week.

Some day, somewhere, we are going to have to cut back on these expenditures. The alternative is national bankruptcy, wild inflation, and devaluation of our currency.

On 14 appropriation bills passed by the House the Senate has added, all together, \$5.5 billion. To finance that \$5 billion or \$5.5 billion it would take a straight 5-percent increase in all income taxes, individual and corporation, across the board. It would take that just to finance the increases in appropriations that have been voted by the Senate during this calendar year.

Lest there be any misunderstanding that I am putting all this responsibility on the Senate or the Congress, as the President sees fit to do, I want to point out that the President signs each of these spending bills, and it does not take any more ink to sign a veto message than it does to sign bills into law.

I have no respect for the President's argument when he says he is against these expenditures and then signs every one of them, following this action by addressing a group in Miami and bragging about how much he is giving away. What makes this worse, he goes to another group and boasts about economy.

This is the time for both the legislative and executive branches to put their votes where their mouths are. If they are for economy they should vote for it. If they are against it they should stop talking about it. If they are concerned about tax increases they should remember that while voting for ever-expanding increases in appropriations we are, in effect, voting for tax increases, whether they are passed this year or next year.

The result of spending more and more money, as we have been doing, and not voting for taxes is that more and more inflation will result in the destruction of the purchasing power of the American dollar.

We shall be voting tomorrow on the social security bill, which I intend to vote for, but let us face up to it. The benefits under the social security bill for those living on pensions will vanish and erode within 2 years at the present rate we are going if we do not do something to check the inflationary spiral.

I think that one of the criticisms could be made of the first session of the

90th Congress and of the executive branch—and I emphasize equally the executive branch—is that Congress is going to adjourn without having faced up to the problem of cutting back on expenditures and without having acted affirmatively or negatively in making a decision on taxes. I do not think we should have drifted this close to adjournment of the Congress without having faced up to that decision.

It may be unpopular to talk about taxes, but the issue is going to have to be faced at some point, or we in this country will be in the same position as Great Britain and facing the devaluation of our currency.

We are drifting down the road toward national bankruptcy, and thus far there has been no effort, as far as the Senate or the administration is concerned, to check it. All we hear from the administration is a promise of more and more to everybody, at the same time admitting that it does not have the guts to stand up and tell the American people how much it is going to cost them in the form of taxes.

There seems to be a growing sentiment to delay a tax increase until after the votes are counted in 1968. I think this is a cowardly attempt to dodge the issue. I think we ought to face up to our responsibilities.

I respect those who feel that these appropriation bills should be voted for in the full amount. They have just as much right to their opinions as I do to mine; and I respect their views, just as I hope they will respect mine.

But at the same time, those who are willing and anxious to vote for these increased expenditures should be equally willing and equally ready to vote for the taxes to pay for them and to accept that responsibility. I do not think we can vote for the one without considering the effect on the other. Personally, I believe the very least we can do—and this may be the last chance the Senate will have to cut back on an appropriation bill this session—is to show the House of Representatives that we can at least hold the line and are willing to join them in that economy effort.

That is the purpose of my amendment, and I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say—and I think the distinguished Senator from Delaware knows this—that I have joined him many times, arm in arm, on this question of economy in Government. I yield to no one when it comes down to the basic proposition that America and its taxpayers are entitled to a dollar's worth for every dollar that they pay into the Treasury of the United States.

I was Governor of my State, Mr. President, immediately after the cessation of hostilities of World War II. It was a depressing time. All the things that had not been done for 5 years had to be done. We had the problem of education in my State. We had the problem of building new highways. We had the problem of the fact that wages had been frozen and they had to be unfrozen. We needed money to do all these things, and I was the Democratic Governor.

It has always been the philosophy in State politics that a Democrat will never dare suggest a sales tax. Yet I suggested a sales tax in my State, and I became the father of the sales tax in Rhode Island. When the people began to pay that tax, they called it "pennies for Pastore."

But I proved to the people of my State that it was absolutely necessary to impose the tax if we were to develop the welfare of our communities; and I dare say—and I do not say this to boast, but merely to state a fact—that the next election I won by the largest plurality ever given to a Governor in the history of the State of Rhode Island.

I have always been for economy. However, I learned a long time ago that the stature of a nation is not to be judged by figures, either black or red, on the pages of any ledger. Rather, the welfare, the wholesomeness, and the stature of a nation are to be judged in the dignity and the opportunities of its people. That is the test.

I ask my fellow Senators, if you do not want to impose an additional income tax, or you do not want to raise taxes in the United States of America because we are spending too much money, then why do you not vote to knock out the whole amount of the poverty bill?

The relevant question here is, Is this legislation necessary and must the people of the United States rise up to meet their responsibilities and make whatever sacrifices are necessary so that we can uplift the portion of our society that lives almost in a state of degradation?

That is the test. I would hope that sometime the Senator would come to the hearings of the Appropriations Committee—oh, what an experience it would be—to see how we squeeze every nickel. So much so that sometimes the buffalo on that nickel reacts.

Mr. President, this is a dramatic story—a very dramatic story, whether you go to Appalachia, where my distinguished friend from West Virginia comes from, or whether you go to Mississippi, or even come to Rhode Island or Delaware. Ask the people who know this program, and let them tell you about the young boys and girls who have really been given an opportunity, a chance to come out of discouragement, despair, and delinquency—and I use the words properly. I hope we are not going to become a nation of glue sniffers and dope addicts. I hope we are going to begin to do something to lift up that portion of our society that today lives in a state of despair, without hope, and give them the hope that America has always held out to the unfortunate and the poor.

That goes back to my own background. I apologize to no one; there is no man in the United States of America who is more indebted to this blessed land than JOHN PASTORE, and I am proud of it.

Mr. President, what are the facts here? The House of Representatives allowed \$1,612,500,000.

That was the figure from last year. But that figure did not take into account a carryover of approximately \$180 million. We are now engaged in on-going programs that will increase the cost to the Nation, without regard to what has been added in the authoriza-

tion bill. That goes for Headstart-Follow-through, it goes for day care, it goes for food and medical care for the starving children of America. I again say, imagine starving children in this blessed land of ours. Imagine that. We just finished with the foreign aid program. We are going to spend more than \$2 billion all over the world, including India, Pakistan, and every other underprivileged country. But people are starving in the United States. That is a shame. It is a disgrace.

If we want to worry about the balance of payments, about the deficit, about a tax increase, I say to the Senator from Delaware that I shall be the first to stand up and meet my responsibility when the time comes. I did not shirk it before; I am ready to meet it now.

I say that if we want to keep programs going on the level that they are now going, we need \$1,788 million. If we want to fulfill some of the other obligations in the authorization bill, we will need the full estimate of \$2,060 million. We shall have to take into account, also, that we adopted a resolution the other day that requires a 10-percent cut in the programs in this bill and a 2-percent cut in personnel funds. This will have to be taken into account when we go to conference.

I should like to see a balanced budget just as much as anyone else. I should like to see us get along without a tax increase just as much as anyone else does. It is not popular to come out with these figures. Where is the popularity in that? Sometimes, when we do these things, the people who benefit the most realize it the least. There is no big credit in doing it. When I go home, my path will not be strewn with garlands of roses because I voted for the bill. Perhaps I shall receive brickbats. But do I care? I do not care. No one has to put a lei around PASTORE's neck. I do not need it. This could be my albatross. But I am not looking for an albatross and I am not looking for a lei. All I am looking for is dignity and opportunity for Americans, and that is what the bill represents.

Mr. President, do you want to put the figure back to \$1,612,500,000, as the amendment of the Senator from Delaware suggests? To do that, it would be necessary to eliminate 45,000 youths from the Headstart program alone. It would be necessary to discontinue in many communities some of the programs that are already in progress.

If America means atrophy, if it means disintegration, then let us make the reduction. But if America means promise, if it means future, if Senators want to give to the committee that has worked hour after hour on the bill the opportunity to go into conference and reach a solution of the problem, they should follow the committee's recommendation.

I care not what the Senate does. I am not the conscience of the Senate and I am not the conscience of the country. I have enough work to do to take care of my own conscience.

I say to the Senate: "You make your cuts here because it sounds good on Wall Street and it sounds good to the readers of the Wall Street Journal. It is all right with me. But if you are interested in people and in the development of Amer-

ica and in the goal of affording opportunity in America and if you want to take this rebellion off the streets, put the youth of America in gainful occupation, and do the things that need to be done to correct some of our social ills, defeat the amendment."

And I hope we do.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I could not agree more with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island who has so eloquently defended the appropriations bill.

The adoption of the Williams amendment would be an unmitigated catastrophe.

Let us put right on the line what the able Senator from Delaware is proposing and let him know just what is going to happen if the amendment should be agreed to.

I should like to give to my colleagues a review of information prepared at my request for just such an emergency as this by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

If the Williams amendment should be adopted, 14,000 enrollees of the Job Corps would have to be sent home to their urban and rural ghetto homes.

The in-school assistance program would cease for 61,000 students from poor families; 37,000 summer jobs for needy poor youths would be eliminated.

Job training assistance would be killed for 136,200 hard core poor adults in ghetto areas; 185 of the 850 officers of the Legal Services Division of the OEO would be closed; 415 attorneys would be laid off.

Close to 200,000 fewer poor people would receive legal assistance during the fiscal year 1968.

The Headstart program would be reduced by 45,000 children on a full year basis, or one out of every five who participated in the 1966 program; 4,500 non-professionals would lose their jobs; 135 of the community action agencies would have to be eliminated.

There would be no special summer program next summer. Think of what that means in terms of bloodshed in city after city in America.

The rural thrust, which all of us are so concerned about, would be blunted.

There would be no program for the aged.

The wonderful program of the Reverend Leon Sullivan, in Philadelphia, who is operating 18 OIC's throughout the country would be reduced by 25 percent.

The adult education and housing programs for migrants would be cut by 10 percent.

Not only in the VISTA program would the budget result in 3,650 fewer VISTA volunteers by the end of the fiscal year, but it would also mean that the few VISTA training centers would be disbanded, and 1,000 applicants already invited to training would have to be turned down.

The Williams amendment is an unconscionable amendment. It must be rejected by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my remarks will be predicated upon a little different background from those of my

distinguished friends, the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I have consistently voted against authorization for the poverty program, not because I have no sympathy for those people who are poverty stricken, but because there are, in this program, so many features of which I do not approve.

There are some that I do approve of very strongly, as my fellow conferees know, as, for instance, Headstart and the Neighborhood Youth Corps in the various cities.

But we are not deciding here the question of whether Congress sets up that program. That question has already been decided. Congress has passed the authorization measure by a heavy majority.

The decision of the Appropriations Committee is made in the effort to finance the activity which has been set up under the action of Congress, which body represents the majority of the people in this Nation.

If we believe in majority rule, if we believe in supporting programs which have been set up by a heavy majority vote, then our duty on the Appropriations Committee is to try to support at a fair level of operations those activities which have been created by law.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear that with the \$1,980 million which is included here for OEO, when subjected to the 10-percent cut of the budget estimate which we voted—and nobody has been more active in voting for that cut than has the Senator from Florida, who handled the measure on the floor of the Senate and had a good bit to do with it in committee where it was worked out—we will have little more than enough money left with which to carry on the existing activities of this program which is existing not because it was drawn out of a hat by somebody, but because Congress set it up.

I think that so frequently we lose sight of the fact that the Appropriations Committee has some obligation to carry on activities which are lawfully set up.

The pending bill does not have to do solely with the problems of the poor in the larger cities at all. That is largely involved in this particular item for OEO, but the bill also has to do with the carrying on of operations, other than road-building, for the poor areas which exist in the Appalachian region.

It so happens that these two items are bracketed together in the pending bill. And, so far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I support both of them because by law they have been set up. Probably I know more about the Appalachian region because I have been in a goodly portion of it.

I am very strongly in favor of the authorization measure there. Here, though, we are now supporting or refusing to support, as our vote may indicate, the appropriation to carry on operations which have been set up by large majority vote of both Houses of Congress and which carry the majority approval of the people of this country.

I wish to call attention to the fact that, if we approve this bill as written, when the item in it for OEO is subjected

to the 10-percent cut, little more than enough money is left to carry on existing operations of the OEO. It seems to me that is the least the Senate can do in allowing its conferees, who have a rough job ahead of them, to meet in conference with the conferees of the other body.

Mr. President, the position of the Senator from Florida is that the least we should do is to support this appropriation as it is reported by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I correctly understand that the larger figure has been put on so they can take the 10 percent off? In other words, 10 percent has been added so that 10 percent can be taken off?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. The 10 percent is already cut off, I say to my distinguished friend. I do not believe the Senator was present the day we passed the resolution, which he strongly supported; and I am sorry that he could not be present to vote for it. That resolution requires the application of a 10-percent cut to all controllable items in budget estimates—and this is a controllable item—within the appropriations passed by this Congress.

Mr. PASTORE. To answer the question of the Senator from Delaware, he raises a good question, because we discussed it, and we have no intention to deceive anyone.

It is true that, no matter what we do, the 10 percent and the 2 percent will have to be deducted, which will reduce the amount to approximately \$1,865,000,000.

But if we had come in with the figure of \$1,865,000,000, the area in which this question could be resolved would have been brought below what is necessary to continue the on-going programs. We have made that very clear. We are not hiding anything. All we are asking is that we be allowed by the Senate, at this hour, to take the top dollar and the bottom dollar and to negotiate with the House and thrash out the effect of the 10 percent and what it might do to the overall program. We may end up with a very favorable figure.

I say, frankly, that I do not expect to come out of that conference with much more than \$1,788,000,000. How much lower than that it will be, I do not know. But it is our responsibility to convince the House that if it goes below that figure, we will have to withdraw some of these programs.

We have the testimony right here that if the figure of the Senator from Delaware is sustained, we would have to eliminate the 45,000 youngsters from the present Headstart program. I use the word "present" advisedly. The expulsion of 14,000 young men and women now in the Job Corps. They would have to be let go. The elimination of 40,000 young men and women from the current Neighborhood Youth Corps. The expulsion of 7,000 students now in the Upward Bound program. The denial of health services to 50,000 poor people and an additional 50,000 whom a \$198 million appropriation would cover.

That is evidence. If the Senate is willing to pull these people back and take them out of programs in which they already are, then it is the responsibility of the Senate. All we are asking is that we be given the courtesy by the Senate to go in with the top dollar to face the bottom dollar, to see how we can resolve the matter of the 10 percent and the 2 percent as it will affect the overall program.

But so far as coming out with the figure of \$1.98 billion, we do not expect that to happen at all. I cannot be more practical and more truthful than that.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall conclude very quickly. We have cut the authorization which was passed a few days ago from \$2,060 million to \$1,980 million. We have cut that, by action already taken by both Houses of Congress, by an additional 10 percent and 2 percent from the budget estimate—the 10 percent applying to the entire operation, and the 2 percent applying to the salary part of the operation. Now it is proposed to cut still further.

How many times does the Senator want to cut? We have cut twice already, as against the item authorized just a few days ago—once in this bill and once in the resolution for the reduction of 10 percent. Now the Senator wants to cut a third time. If it is cut a third time, I warn the Senator that the figure that he would put in the appropriation cannot carry the existing operation.

So that the question is, how many times do we cut? Are we going to cut off the old cat's tail a little bit at a time so it will not hurt the old gal? What is the principle that the Senator is trying to follow?

The question is simply whether we are going to approve this figure, worked out very painfully in the committee, of which the Senator from Florida happens to be a member. The Senator from Delaware knows that his thinking in this entire field is not very different from that of the Senator from Florida. But the Senator from Florida knows that it is our duty to try to support programs which our majority vote has set up, and we are going to try to sustain them in a rather painful way if this bill is upheld.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not seek to repeat the arguments in opposition to the amendment which have been so eloquently made by Senator PASTORE, who has done such fine work in this field, or by Senator CLARK or by Senator HOLLAND, but, rather, to address myself to another argument of the Senator from Delaware which strikes me as being critically important on this issue. The argument is that because of the fiscal condition of the country, and because we have not voted a tax increase, we must make this drastic reduction. We must bear in mind that such a drastic reduction would drive a great number of children and adults out of these programs. It would close down and deny opportunity to 135 rural community action agencies, despite the urgent claims that it is the rural poor—and I agree with that—who need a great deal of help from us which they have not received.

Is it the essence of the argument that, because we have not passed a tax increase, this money should be taken out of the backs of the poor, because we have not done what we should do? It is not the military effort, it is not the agricultural subsidy program, it is not the supersonic plane, it is not mass transit, it is not the subsidies to the airlines and the airports, and it is not other programs we have passed in the Senate which should suffer; but the argument is that the poor of the United States should pay that bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I know this will not shock my friend, the Senator from Delaware, because he is in favor of it, also: It does not even mean the 27½-percent oil-depletion allowance. I know that the Senator from Delaware has been trying to lower that, and I have been with him, shoulder to shoulder.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. And I am in favor of that, also. That is estimated to take a minimum of \$1½ billion a year.

Mr. President, I have a very deep affection for the Senator from Delaware—he is one of the most vigilant and conscientious Senators on the floor—and anything I say is directed solely toward the policy issue involved. We are facing a nation of 29 million people who are below the poverty level. The entire civil rights struggle is also now deeply imbedded in the issue of the antipoverty program.

As a matter of fact the entire issue of civil rights has now become merged in the problems of the cities and the problems of the antipoverty program. What are we doing? Are we living in a dream world? Do we expect millions of people in the cities to sit still and not react violently as we do them an injustice like this?

Mr. President, I voted for appropriations for Vietnam, too. I am not going to let our people down, no matter how I feel about that struggle. However, think of the discrimination these poor people face and look at the ammunition that you furnish every agitator.

This program is now to be slashed, not with a scalpel, but with a cutlass. Then, we say, "Be nice and quiet because the United States is going to look after your interests and do right by you."

We should do that, states the distinguished Senator from Delaware, because we did not have the courage to vote for a tax increase. Therefore, we are to do it at the expense of the poor who live in the slums and ghettos to whom we have said, at least impliedly, "You have a right to depend on us to get you out of where you are."

I could not think of anything more counterproductive in terms of the crisis of the cities and I could not think of anything more dangerous in terms of the tranquillity of the country than to do this.

We will be coming back here in January. I deeply feel that Congress will have to meet its further responsibilities in January. We have met a part of that responsibility by retrenching certain programs, which unhappily includes this

program, and we shall meet more of that responsibility, in my judgment, by a tax increase which undoubtedly will be retroactive until January 1.

Mr. President, I think this would be the worst form of scrimping and saving we could undertake. This view also comes from those who have a more conservative view. The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is not a Member who has a reckless view with regard to the poverty program, and he heard, as I did, the evidence. If we take a chunk out of this program, and really dig into its vitals in a most damaging way, it would be the worst form of discounting we could undertake.

By all means let us not penalize these people who are the least able to stand it, in an area where the greatest danger to public tranquillity is involved. I am not condoning in the remotest way violence, riots, or anything like that. However, we should not encourage them and we should not toss around the straw, the gasoline, and the matches which bring those things about because we have not enough brains to say at least what we are doing now should be effectively continued.

Mr. President, this cut would ruin that opportunity, let alone opportunities to improve the program or develop constructive programs for the poor. This is a very sober time and a very dangerous time. Let us not contribute to the problem ourselves in any such wanton way as this.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MILLER and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island, I think, gave a very fair and frank analysis of what cuts would do to this program. All of us appreciate that. I would like to clarify one matter.

The Senator read a number of figures regarding how many people would have to be let go in certain programs if something happened. What figure was the Senator premising that on?

Mr. PASTORE. Because the present on-going program is predicated upon the money that was available last year, which was \$1,612,500,000, plus a carry-over in the neighborhood of about \$180 million, which gave the figure that now tells us we need \$1,788,000,000, which is substantially higher than the figure suggested in this cut if we are to maintain programs on the current level.

If we do not provide this money, all that the Senator from Rhode Island said was, we will have to take 45,000 from the Head Start program and 14,000 from the Job Corps. If you want to restrict, and cut down the program, vote for the amendment. If Senators wish to keep it this way, reject the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Rhode Island is talking about what would happen if the Senate agreed to the Williams amendment now at the desk?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator said if we had \$1,788,000,000 this would enable present programs to continue.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. If we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Delaware this would have the implications he read from his paper.

Mr. PASTORE. Not implications; it would have the result.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to get that matter clarified.

I believe the Senator read that some 14,000 members of the Job Corps would have to be let go.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct; pulled out or expelled.

Mr. MILLER. I do not question the Senator's figures, which I am sure he received from OEO, that if the cost of enrollees for the Job Corps continued at the present levels this is what would happen.

However, what this implies is if the cost continues at \$7,500 a year, which the Senator from Iowa submits is very extravagant and excessive, we will have to let 14,000 of those members go.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that very point?

Mr. MILLER. I would like to finish my thought.

Mr. PASTORE. I think we should get an understanding.

Mr. MILLER. If the cost of the enrollee can be reduced to what I think most people regard to be a reasonable figure, perhaps none of these people would have to be let go.

Mr. PASTORE. That is not exactly right. Where did the Senator get his figure of \$7,500? When we started the program, I was the most critical Senator of all. I hope the Senator does not think that I sat there and played tiddly winks. I asked questions, and I hope I asked some pretty good questions. I was upset at the cost of the program. I was upset that they would take somebody from Florida and send him to California. That is no longer done. The reason it was done in the beginning was that they had only two camps, one in the East and one in the West. Now, I understand there are 123 camps, and the cost is coming down.

Mr. MILLER. Down from where?

Mr. PASTORE. But if one listens to the dramatic stories of the good that has been done with respect to these boys and girls who were not good for much and now today are in gainful employment, we are saving the soul of America and here we are quibbling about the relatively small amount it will cost.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I would like to make a brief response to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The Senator from Rhode Island says that the cost is coming down. Indeed, the cost had better come down. They started out at a figure of \$12,500 per enrollee. These are not my figures, but they are figures that Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, dug out during the hearings last year. In fact, they were so flagrant that Congress legislated a \$7,500 ceiling when we passed the OEO bill. I suggest they should come down more. I suggest that \$7,500 is still excessive. I think most taxpayers regard it as excessive. While they want to do something for

these underprivileged young people, at the same time they think the taxpayers are being overreached upon.

My point is that if there is a cutback in costs that would not mean that 14,000 members would be turned out into the street. It would mean that OEO would reduce the cost per enrollee and keep them all there and do a better job.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement of fact?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The actual cost is \$6,700. We investigated the entire Job Corps program recently. The committee is completely satisfied. This goes for both sides of the aisle. I am the ranking member on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Mr. Kelly, the new Administrator of the Job Corps, is doing an extraordinary job of really bringing down the costs. They will be brought down even further. I can certify that to the Senator as a fact, whatever deductions he may draw to meet his own conscience. Fourteen thousand will be let out. There is no other way.

A very creditable record is now being made on costs. Costs are being brought down even further. This is the raw material for the very crime and juvenile delinquency which Senators in this Chamber are inveighing against every day. These boys are here instead of out where they could make that 16-percent increase in crime—32 percent. This is money well spent. To turn the kids out would be a real disaster. I hope it will not happen. I hope that the Senate will be much wiser than that.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from New York, but I do not believe that most of the taxpayers of this country, especially those in the lower income brackets who are having a hard time scraping up \$1,000 or \$1,200 a year to put their children through college, will be reassured that the cost of the Job Corps is now what the Senator from New York says it is. It is an improvement, to have been brought down that far, but it still has a long way to go before the taxpayers, who are having a hard time supporting their own children, are going to be thinking that it is down to a proper size.

There is another point. I point to the fact that only one out of four members of the Job Corps have graduated. That may not be true today. That is an overall figure for all years. The Senator from New York knows as well as anyone that we went through the problem of improper screening of Job Corps applicants. There has not been proper screening of Job Corps applicants, and, as a result, we tightened it up on the floor a few weeks ago. I had an amendment which the Senator in charge of the bill agreed to adopt and which I hope will be helpful in this respect.

Just because it might result in 14,000 fewer members of the Job Corps does not, to me, mean that we are going to take 14,000 of those who should be in the Job Corps and turn them loose. It might well mean that there would be a reduction of 14,000 who should not be there in the first place, because if they go there

they will never complete the course. Thus, I think one can use the figure of 14,000 for whatever purposes he wishes.

I do not deny the sincerity of my good friend from Rhode Island, but I do not think it needs to work out this way. I would say, let them screen out those who should not be admitted into the Job Corps in the first place. We will have a better program. More will graduate because they will not be deterred from staying in by being put in with the undesirables.

Mr. PASTORE. Could the Senator document the statement he has just made?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. PASTORE. Can the Senator prove that they have 14,000 that do not belong there?

Mr. MILLER. I have not said that—

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; that is what the Senator said. The Senator said they take the 14,000 that do not need to be there.

Mr. MILLER. What the Senator had to say did not necessarily cover those already in the Job Corps. Can the Senator tell me the number in the Job Corps today?

Mr. PASTORE. There are about 42,000.

Mr. MILLER. Take the number in the Job Corps today.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not have the floor, but I will yield to him anyway. [Laughter.]

Mr. JAVITS. Forty-two thousand are in the Job Corps today. Fourteen thousand is one-third. What the Senator from Iowa is arguing is that one-third of the members of the Job Corps can be screened out as undesirable, which is absolutely—

Mr. PASTORE. Why say one-third? Why not 75 percent?

Mr. JAVITS. Might as well.

Mr. PASTORE. Why not all of them? If we want to argue it to its ultimate conclusion, why not forget about the whole program?

Mr. MILLER. I know that many Senators do not like the amendment, but I should like to make this point: Take those who should not be screened into the Job Corps, leave them out, and reduce the cost per enrollee in the Job Corps down to what the taxpayers would consider to be a reasonable cost, and we will be able to do it.

I would hope that Mr. Kelley would be able to do that.

Mr. PASTORE. If what the Senator is saying is true, then the first thing I would do would be to ask for the resignation of Sargent Shriver. That is the only way to answer the Senator's question. If we have 14,000 people upon whom we can spend this money, who do not belong in the program because there is no potentiality and no opportunities for them, then we should fire the Director. That is the answer I give to the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. Then we should ask for Sargent Shriver's resignation, because the record will show how many thousands in the Job Corps—

Mr. PASTORE. Why does not the Senator just try it?

Mr. MILLER (continuing). Should not have gotten in there in the first place.

They drop out. The record is replete with examples of that. If the Senator will look at it, we crossed that bridge several weeks ago.

Mr. PASTORE. I was not on the same bridge, I will tell the Senator that.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in support of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. There certainly is a need to help the poor people in this country. It might require even more money than this, if it were done properly. For example, if we wanted to help the poor people any place in the United States, it would be more effectively and efficiently handled by the welfare agencies of the States and counties, by people who are trained in the business, rather than on a partisan and political basis.

If we want to help the schoolchildren, we should handle it through the school officials in the various States and counties throughout the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Of all the programs under consideration, the one which has been the real butt of most of the criticism is the community action program. That is the one program that is a grassroots program.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I believe that, if we want to take one step toward doing this on a bipartisan and nonpolitical basis, we should make the announcement on a nonpolitical basis rather than through political channels.

Mr. PASTORE. How are we going to do it on a nonpolitical basis when 90 percent of the Republicans vote against it?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. They are trying to handle this program every place in the United States on a political basis, and not based upon recommendations of welfare agencies. The amount of money suggested by the Senator from Delaware would do a far better job, if handled on that kind of basis rather than on a strictly partisan, political basis. Almost every official of this program is appointed not on the basis of what he knows about helping poor people but rather on his political record.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has made a very good point. The argument has been made here that this amendment would completely wreck the program, perhaps require a drop of one-third of the Job Corps and practically one-third or one-half of the rest of the program. Those are scare tactics. The question that comes to my mind is this: if the adoption of this amendment cutting 18 percent from the appropriation

would destroy one-third or one-half of the services being rendered what are they going to do with the rest of the money, unless they are going to pour it down the rat-hole with fat bureaucratic salaries?

At least three top officials of this Poverty Program are now being paid more than General Westmoreland.

Why not cut back on some of these high-paid bureaucrats?

Let us face it. We hear the same arguments and listen to the same speeches, with just a change in a few words, during the debate on every effort to cut every single appropriation bill which has been before Congress.

They always claim that the Senator from Delaware is heartless in trying to cut any appropriations. Again today they cite the foreign aid program as an excuse that we are feeding people all

over the world so why cut any other program. I remind Senators I did not vote for that program, which had \$500 million in it more than had been approved by the House. I did not vote for it, but there were only 22 votes against it. Those who supported that foreign aid bill are not in a position to use it now as an excuse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of appropriation bills which have been voted on this year, showing that the Senate added \$4,055,148,620 more than was in the amendment, as well as a tabulation on the foreign aid bill where we had another \$500-odd million over and beyond the House figure be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1968 APPROPRIATIONS

Date		Amount in House	Amount in Senate	Senate increase or (decrease) over House	Amount of 1967 appropriation increase or (decrease)
Mar. 17	H.R. 7123: Supplemental Defense.....	\$12,196,520,000	\$12,275,870,000	\$79,350,000	-----
May 19	H.R. 7501: Treasury, Post Office, Executive Office.....	7,499,230,000	7,555,167,000	55,937,000	\$459,108,865
May 16	H.R. 9029: Interior.....	1,365,310,150	1,399,242,050	33,931,900	66,083,250
May 17	H.R. 9481: 2d Supplemental.....	2,041,826,133	2,260,246,933	218,420,800	-----
Aug. 29	H.R. 9960: Independent offices and HUD.....	9,985,878,782	10,431,460,900	445,582,118	880,461,600
Aug. 1	H.R. 10196: Labor and HEW.....	13,137,488,000	13,409,835,000	272,347,000	1,555,000,000
Sept. 26	H.R. 10345: Participation certificates.....	881,000,000	3,235,000,000	2,354,000,000	393,270,800
	State, Justice, Commerce.....	2,194,026,500	2,185,870,500	(8,156,000)	52,782,300
June 29	H.R. 10368: Legislative branch.....	150,000,000	150,000,000	-----	(700,000,000)
July 11	H.R. 10509: Participation certificates.....	228,089,952	273,662,404	45,572,452	3,159,461
	Agriculture.....	13,370,580,950	13,797,673,400	427,092,450	1332,101,950
Aug. 4	H.R. 10738: Defense.....	800,000,000	700,000,000	(100,000,000)	100,000,000
Sept. 28	H.R. 11456: Transportation.....	70,295,200,000	70,156,420,000	(138,780,000)	(73,202,000)
28	H.R. 11641: Public Works and Atomic Energy.....	1,530,198,372	1,651,407,272	121,208,900	(69,910,228)
Oct. 3	H.R. 12474: NASA.....	4,622,922,000	4,776,064,000	153,142,000	465,893,000
		4,583,400,000	4,678,900,000	95,500,000	(289,100,000)
	Total.....	134,881,670,839	138,936,819,459	4,055,148,620	3,175,648,998

¹ Restoration of capital by CCC not included.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senate record on spending is clear. It has consistently added to these spending programs. Furthermore, every time an effort to reduce is made, we get the same arguments that we are destroying the program. The proponents of more spending march the poor widows and orphans through the Senate Chamber to point up the argument.

Perhaps one reason why these poor widows and orphans are in such dire shape is that they are walked to death across this Chamber, in an effort to justify every spending program that some bureaucrat can conceive.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In just a moment.

Then too we hear talk about the crime rate getting worse and that this or that program is going to solve the crime rate. We are all concerned about the crime rate, but before discussing this point, Mr. President, I have a tabulation of various votes on Senate efforts to cut appropriations. This tabulation shows that the Senate rejected every effort to cut the appropriations and supported and passed every amendment that would increase the appropriations. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

Had these efforts to reduce appropriations been successful it would have reduced the cost of Government by around \$4½ billion.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECORD VOTES ON REDUCTIONS IN 1968 APPROPRIATIONS

	Vote No.	Date, 1967	Vote	Amount of reduction or increase		Vote No.	Date, 1967	Vote	Amount of reduction or increase
H.R. 10509—Agriculture (Williams): Limit subsidy payments to \$10,000.	129	July 13	14 to 76.....	\$329,174,519	H.R. 9960—Independent Offices and HUD (committee): Increase model cities funds.	194	Sept. 20	62 to 28.....	\$300,000,000
H.R. 10509—Agriculture (Williams): Reduce from \$220,000,000 to \$120,000,000 new ACP authority.	130	..do...	10 to 82.....	100,000,000	H.R. 9960—Independent offices and HUD (Harris): Increase funds for National Science Foundation.	197	..do...	63 to 25.....	46,000,000
H.R. 10196—Labor-HEW (Williams motion): Recommit bill to reduce 5 percent.	144	Aug. 2	19 to 64.....	675,000,000	H.R. 9960—Independent offices and HUD (committee): Increase authorization for sale of HUD participation certificates.	198	Sept. 21	57 to 30.....	1,804,000,000
H.R. 10738—Defense (Kennedy of Massachusetts): Reduce from \$482,000 to \$200,000 rifle practice funds.	170	Aug. 22	23 to 67.....	228,000	H.R. 9960—Independent offices and HUD (committee): Increase funds for HUD participation certificate insufficiencies.	199	..do...	54 to 32.....	19,115,000
H.R. 9960—Independent Offices and HUD (Young of Ohio): Reduce civil defense funds by \$20,000,000.	188	Sept. 19	32 to 55.....	20,000,000	H.R. 11456—Transportation (Proxmire): Reduce supersonic transport funds.	283	Oct. 5	19 to 54.....	141,375,000
H.R. 9960—Independent Offices and HUD (Williams): Cut public building construction funds by \$21,036,200.	189	..do..	27 to 57.....	21,036,200	H.R. 11456—Transportation (Williams): Reduce FAA equipment funds.	284	..do...	2 to 68.....	37,000,000
H.R. 9960—Independent Offices and HUD (committee): Increase funds for Federal office building construction.	191	..do..	63 to 23.....	16,130,000	H.R. 12474—NASA (Proxmire-Williams): Reduce funds for several programs.	286	Oct. 6	30 to 36.....	100,500,000
H.R. 9960—Independent Offices and HUD (committee): Increase authorization for sale of VA participation certificates.	192	..do..	56 to 31.....	550,000,000	H.R. 12474—NASA (Williams): Reduce funds for Voyager program.	287	..do...	31 to 34.....	26,000,000
H.R. 9960—Independent Offices and HUD (committee): Increase grants for neighborhood facilities.	193	..do..	60 to 23.....	15,000,000	H.R. 11641—Public works (Williams): Reduce general construction funds.	289	Oct. 9	12 to 61.....	18,516,000
					H.R. 11641—Public works (Williams motion): Recommit to cut funds.	290	Oct. 10	27 to 54.....	247,808,200
					H.R. 10345—State, Justice (Williams): Eliminate SACB funds.	295	Oct. 11	37 to 54.....	295,000

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, to continue the discussions on the crime rate—we are all concerned about the crime rate but to say that the adoption of this amendment would result in an increase in the crime rate is absurd. That is a fallacious argument.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I received from J. Edgar Hoover, under date of October 11, 1967, including a tabulation showing the increase in the crime rate over the past 10 years, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and tabulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D.C., October 20, 1967.
Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have been advised of your request for national crime statistics pertaining to crime rates from 1958 to 1966.

There is enclosed a tabulation showing the percent change in the national Crime Index rate for the years requested. Current population for each year was used in constructing the rate.

I hope the information will be of use to you.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

Percent change, national crime index rate per 100,000 population, October 20, 1967

1957	-----	2½
1958	-----	+7
1959	-----	-1
1960	-----	+13
1961	-----	+1
1962	-----	+5
1963	-----	+9
1964	-----	+12
1965	-----	+5
1966	-----	+10

By direct comparison the crime rate increase was 79 percent, 1966 over 1957. The source for this data is Uniform Crime Reports.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Quoting from this letter, the crime rate has increased 79 percent between 1957 and 1966. The most rapid increase in the crime rate has taken place in the recent years, increasing 10 to 12 percent. So the more money we spend does not mean the less crime we are getting in America.

Let us face it, the real problem of crime in America is not the lack of money in these programs. It is not the lack of laws. It is because we have a Department of Justice that is too soft on criminals and courts that are too lenient in dealing with convictions. You can pour all the money in the Federal Treasury on the streets of America, but until our courts and administration officials and our Department of Justice start backing up our police officers and start enforcing the laws on our statute books we are not going to solve crime.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Do I understand the Senator correctly? Is the Senator logically arguing that if we cut out this program, there will be less crime; that the less money we spend, the less crime we would have?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not at all.

Mr. PASTORE. That is what the Senator said. He said we keep spending more money and we have more crime.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No—

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator had better read the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Rhode Island was justifying this appropriation on the basis of combating crime. I am refuting his argument and saying that it is not a question of whether we are for or against crime. It is a question of how far we can go toward increasing expenditures. I merely pointed out that as we increase the expenditures we do not solve crime on that basis. So the argument does not stand.

Speaking of the argument that we should not discuss taxes at the same time we are dealing with a program for the poor, I want to point out that I have expressed this concern on numerous occasions heretofore. I am sure the Senator from New York will agree with me on this point. I have discussed the fiscal policies of our Government each time we have acted on increasing these expenditures. I have been very much concerned over the financial condition of our Treasury. I think Congress has negligent in

meeting its responsibility by going home without having faced up to the problem of what we will do on taxes. Why delay this decision?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Can the Senator name a better ally than the Senator from Rhode Island in this crusade? I ask the Senator, can he name a better ally?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator wants an answer, he can read documents I have placed in the RECORD.

Mr. PASTORE. No. Answer the question. Can the Senator name a better ally in economy votes?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will answer the question if the Senator insists. The answer is that I never had a poorer ally in the Senate when voting or making an effort to cut appropriations, and the vote numbers on those votes are as follows: 129, 140, 144, 170, 186, 190, 192, 194, 197, 199, 283, 284, 286, 287, 289, 290, 295.

It will be found that the Senator from Rhode Island has been the weakest ally I could have had. I am sorry he forced an answer.

Mr. PASTORE. Read the ones in which I am with the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have read all of them.

Mr. PASTORE. Those are the times the Senator was wrong, and I am going to vote against him on this one, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is expected, and that will make a perfect score. The Senator from Rhode Island wanted his score in the RECORD. I am not being personal, but he wanted an answer.

We talk economy. The Senator from Rhode Island, with his great voice and great oratory—and I love to hear him, is one of the strongest advocates when speaking for economy, but speeches do not count. It is votes that count. We have to have votes in order to cut appropriations. The Senator from Rhode Island makes the best speech I have ever heard for economy, but he does not vote for cuts.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. PASTORE. I invite the Senator, very respectfully and cordially, to go down to the committee and see what the Senator from Rhode Island does in working on these bills. It is easy for someone to take the floor and say, "Let us cut it by \$1 billion. Let us cut it by \$100 million." The Senator does not have the responsibility; he is not on the committee. He says on the floor, "Let us cut some money out of this." It makes beautiful headlines. It appears in all the newspapers in Delaware and all over the country. But does it take into account the time, the inquiry, the exhaustive investigation into the bill that we brought out?

Take the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on defense and take these other bills. After all, I am bringing out a report that was passed by the whole Appropriations Committee. These are not men of indiscretion. These are not wasteful men. These are not evil men. These are men concerned with the stability of the country. These are men interested in the balance of payments. They are interested in deficits as much as the Senator from Delaware is.

This idea that everybody is out of step except the Senator from Delaware I cannot buy. I cannot buy that. I know it is easy to be a hero. I know the path of a hero. I know how it is to be popular. What the Senator is doing this afternoon is very popular. I know he will get the headlines. I will not get them. But in going home I will feel I have done my job as conscientiously as I could, just as conscientiously as the Senator from Delaware feels he has done his job. I have no apology to make to him or anybody else. I am responsible only to the people of Rhode Island, and last time they did very fine by me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am always delighted to hear the Senator from Rhode Island. But he tries to infer that any Senator who is not a member of his committee should not offer amendments or express opinions on the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. I did not say that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We have bills reported out of other committees, and the Senator from Rhode Island expresses very strong beliefs and offers amendments for or against them. I am not intimidated by any such argument. I do not question his sincerity. I only pointed out the record when he asked that his voting record be put in. He asked the specific question. That is the only time I mentioned it. Otherwise I was not going to mention how he voted. That was his business.

The Senator has a perfect right to vote as he wishes. I do not question his sincerity. I only wish he would attribute to the Senator from Delaware the same degree of sincerity. I have tried to hold back increased appropriations in all of these agencies. I am vitally concerned with the fiscal condition of the Government. We have large deficits. We have interest rates at the highest level they have been in 100 years. We are not going to control inflation or balance the budget unless we do it by our votes, unless we cut back on programs, some of which are popular.

That is true of both the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Rhode Island.

I realize we are going to have to cut back some services under these programs, and it is going to be hard; but I do not think it should be claimed that we are destroying a program just because we reduce its appropriations.

As evidence of good faith, I notice that Mr. Shriver has stated publicly that he only needs in order to carry out all his programs—and I am quoting from the Washington Post—\$1,785,880,000. He has admitted that that is enough to carry out their programs. That is \$200 million below the figure that is in the Senate bill.

If it will make my friend happier I will modify my amendment to give them just what the Department itself says its needs. That would save \$192 million. Why give them any more?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point? I have explained that. If we take the figure of \$1,788,000,000, then the area for compromise is between the \$1,612,500,000, and the \$1,788,000,000. I have explained all that.

I think we have been very practical and honest about that. As I have previously stated on this floor, all we want to do is go in with the top dollar, in order to have a bargaining position. I stated that I did not expect to come out of that conference with much more than the figure of which the Senator has spoken. All I am asking is that he just not handcuff us.

As to the question of sincerity, I gave the Senator credit for sincerity. The Senator came out with the list of times I supported him and I did not support him. Talking about getting personal; the Senator stayed up all night trying to be personal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, I did not. I was just prepared to answer the question of the Senator from Rhode Island when he asked it.

Mr. PASTORE. I mean, after all, the Senator did not pick up those figures off the floor. There was obviously considerable research involved. The Senator must have had somebody on his staff looking it up.

But let me say to the Senator from Delaware, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and a member of the majority party, we always appropriate less than the budget estimate. We make that decision on the Appropriations Committee. We come out on the floor, after we have talked about it, after we have analyzed the situation. Then the Senator from Delaware comes along and makes a motion to reduce it even further.

I know the facts. What does the Senator expect me to do, to abandon my committee after all the work we put in?

The best example I can state today is that of the Senator from Florida. Here is a Senator who does not approve of all these programs, but he was down at the meetings, where we went through everything in detail, and he stood up today and said, "For purposes of convenience and for purposes of cooperation and help, I sustain the figure that was reported by the committee."

If Senator HOLLAND should vote against the Senator from Delaware today, is he going to say he is an irresponsible spender?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am not saying anything to that effect.

Mr. PASTORE. Of course not. One has got to sustain his committee, as a matter of practical politics. The Senator knows the rules as well as I do. After we evaluate it, and come up with the decision, and a majority vote is taken, then we come out on the floor and seek to sustain our committee.

Now the Senator from Delaware comes along and, out of thin air, makes a motion to reduce the amount, and I do not follow him; what does that make me? Does that make me a lesser man than the Senator? Does that make me a bigger spender?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have not questioned at any time the sincerity of the Senator from Rhode Island or that of any other Member of the Senate. The Senator from Rhode Island asked me a question, and I answered him. The votes I put in were not intended to show the voting record of the Senator from Rhode Island or any other Senator. They represent the results of the votes of the U.S. Senate as a whole. No Senator's votes are identified.

The reason I had them tabulated—and I did it myself—they were tabulated and put into the RECORD about 4 weeks ago in connection with a statement I made to point out that the U.S. Senate this year has not lived up to its promises of reducing Government expenditures. The Senate has increased appropriations this year by more than \$4.5 billion over what was appropriated for the same measures by the House of Representatives.

I listed every single rollcall vote that was taken in connection with 13 appropriation bills, the ones I voted for, the ones I voted against, and the ones that the Senator from Rhode Island and every other Senator voted for as well as the ones they voted against. But the Senator from Rhode Island was not satisfied.

The Senator kept insisting that he wanted his record made clear and just insisted that I answer his question. I thought he wanted it put before the Senate. He asked for it, and I gave it to him. I apologize here and now, publicly, if in any way my putting his voting record into the RECORD has embarrassed him.

Mr. PASTORE. It does not embarrass me as much as it annoys me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just a minute; I have the floor. I apologize for annoying the Senator from Rhode Island. I do not wish to excite him, annoy him, or embarrass him because I love him too much.

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, I tell the world.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Now I hope he does not get excited.

Mr. PASTORE. There is one thing about PASTORE; he has very fine blood pressure. He has no ulcers. What he has to say, he says it. He bears no ill will toward any man; when it is over, it is over; and let me conclude by saying I dearly love my friend from Delaware. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In just a moment.

Mr. President, certainly there is no one I would rather debate or work with than the Senator from Rhode Island. I think we both enjoy it, and it is certainly

nothing personal. We are the best of friends.

Mr. President, I shall yield in just a moment to the Senator from Iowa, but as evidence of the seriousness of our financial position, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report furnished by the Department of

Commerce which contains a tabulation of the bankruptcies filed for the past several years along with a breakdown of the different groups involved.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANKRUPTCY FILINGS BY CLASS

Fiscal year	Chapter XIII	Employee	Nonbusiness	Business	Total bankruptcy case filings	Fiscal year	Chapter XIII	Employee	Nonbusiness	Business	Total bankruptcy case filings
1939	1,639				50,997	1954	9,634	40,889	44,248	8,888	53,136
1940	3,260	36,843	39,073	13,248	52,577	1955	9,864	46,163	50,219	9,185	59,404
1941	4,433	42,348	44,713	11,619	56,335	1956	9,535	48,784	52,608	9,478	62,086
1942	4,100	40,180	42,251	9,858	52,109	1957	11,549	59,053	63,617	10,144	73,761
1943	2,007	27,020	28,782	5,929	34,711	1958	13,391	73,379	80,265	11,403	91,668
1944	1,249	15,460	16,752	2,781	19,533	1959	12,993	81,516	88,943	11,729	100,672
1945	1,248	10,010	11,051	1,811	12,862	1960	13,599	89,639	97,750	12,284	110,034
1946	1,371	7,618	8,566	1,630	10,196	1961	19,723	119,117	131,402	15,241	146,643
1947	2,354	9,396	10,234	2,936	13,170	1962	22,880	120,742	132,125	15,655	147,780
1948	3,315	12,546	13,537	4,973	18,510	1963	24,329	127,156	139,190	16,303	155,493
1949	5,111	17,772	19,144	6,877	26,021	1964	27,292	141,550	155,209	16,510	171,719
1950	6,007	22,933	25,040	8,352	33,392	1965	28,027	148,965	163,413	16,910	180,323
1951	6,924	25,984	27,806	7,387	35,193	1966	28,261	160,299	175,924	16,430	192,354
1952	7,397	26,527	28,331	6,542	34,873	1967	31,963	174,205	191,729	16,600	208,329
1953	8,670	31,253	33,315	6,772	40,087						

NUMBER OF BANKRUPTCY CASES FILED BY OCCUPATIONS IN THE BUSINESS AND NONBUSINESS GROUPS FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1940 THROUGH 1967

Fiscal year	Nonbusiness			Business						Grand total	National population
	Employee	Others not in business	Total	Merchants	Manufacturers	Farmers	Professionals	Others in business	Total		
1940	36,843	2,230	39,073	4,651	921	2,678	801	4,197	13,248	52,321	132,122,000
Percent of total	70.4	4.3	74.7	8.9	1.8	5.1	1.5	8	25.3	100	
1941	42,348	2,365	44,713	4,278	766	2,367	744	3,464	11,619	56,332	133,402,000
Percent of total	75.2	4.2	79.4	7.6	1.4	4.2	1.3	6.1	20.6	100	
1942	40,180	2,071	42,251	3,386	507	2,048	581	3,336	9,858	52,109	134,860,000
Percent of total	77.1	4	81.1	6.5	1	3.9	1.1	6.4	18.9	100	
1943	27,020	1,762	28,782	1,775	286	1,151	395	2,322	5,929	34,711	136,739,000
Percent of total	77.8	5.1	82.9	5.1	0.8	3.3	1.2	6.7	17.1	100	
1944	15,460	1,292	16,752	554	181	512	211	1,323	2,781	19,533	138,397,000
Percent of total	79.2	6.6	85.8	2.8	0.9	2.6	1.1	6.8	14.2	100	
1945	10,010	1,041	11,051	287	153	305	152	914	1,811	12,862	139,928,000
Percent of total	77.8	8.1	85.9	2.2	1.2	2.4	1.2	7.1	14.1	100	
1946	7,618	948	8,566	236	201	260	112	821	1,630	10,196	141,389,000
Percent of total	74.7	9.3	84.0	2.3	2	2.5	1.1	8.1	16	100	
1947	9,396	838	10,234	631	596	183	111	1,415	2,936	13,170	144,126,000
Percent of total	71.3	6.4	77.7	4.8	4.5	1.4	0.8	10.8	22.3	100	
1948	12,546	911	13,537	1,338	808	167	114	2,546	4,973	18,510	146,631,000
Percent of total	67.8	5.3	73.1	7.2	4.4	0.9	0.6	13.8	26.9	100	
1949	17,772	1,372	19,144	1,969	853	232	159	3,664	6,877	26,021	149,188,000
Percent of total	68.3	5.3	73.6	7.5	3.3	0.9	0.6	14.1	26.4	100	
1950	22,933	2,107	25,040	2,565	803	290	126	4,568	8,352	33,392	151,677,000
Percent of total	68.7	6.3	75	7.7	2.4	0.8	0.4	13.7	25	100	
1951	25,984	1,822	27,806	2,360	522	205	127	4,173	7,387	35,193	154,360,000
Percent of total	73.8	5.2	79	6.7	1.5	0.6	0.4	11.8	21	100	
1952	26,527	1,804	28,331	2,319	532	196	137	3,358	6,542	34,873	156,981,000
Percent of total	76.1	5.2	81.3	6.6	1.5	0.6	0.4	9.6	18.7	100	
1953	31,253	2,062	33,315	2,402	518	214	140	3,498	6,772	40,087	159,696,000
Percent of total	78	5.1	83.1	6	1.3	0.5	0.4	8.7	16.9	100	
1954	40,889	3,359	44,248	3,191	745	322	154	4,476	8,888	53,136	162,409,000
Percent of total	77	6.3	83.3	6	1.4	0.6	0.3	8.4	16.7	100	
1955	46,163	4,056	50,219	3,317	750	386	217	4,515	9,185	59,404	165,248,000
Percent of total	77.7	6.8	84.5	5.6	1.3	0.6	0.4	7.6	15.5	100	
1956	48,784	3,824	52,608	3,155	730	400	212	4,981	9,478	62,086	168,091,000
Percent of total	78.6	6.2	84.8	5.1	1.2	0.6	0.3	8	15.2	100	
1957	59,053	4,564	63,617	3,160	665	405	204	5,710	10,144	73,761	171,191,000
Percent of total	80.1	6.2	86.3	4.3	0.9	0.5	0.3	7.7	13.7	100	
1958	73,379	6,886	80,265	3,504	758	332	284	6,525	11,403	91,668	174,000,000
Percent of total	80.1	7.5	87.6	3.8	0.8	0.4	0.3	7.1	12.4	100	
1959	81,516	7,427	88,943	3,400	634	408	403	6,857	11,729	100,672	177,128,000
Percent of total	81	7.4	88.4	3.4	0.6	0.4	0.4	6.8	11.6	100	
1960	89,639	8,111	97,750	3,157	624	453	495	7,555	12,284	110,034	180,670,000
Percent of total	81.4	7.4	88.8	2.9	0.6	0.4	0.4	6.9	11.2	100	
1961	119,117	12,285	131,402	4,244	790	546	623	9,038	15,241	146,643	182,868,000
Percent of total	81.2	8.4	89.6	2.9	0.5	0.4	0.4	6.2	10.4	100	
1962	120,742	11,383	132,125	4,295	735	548	771	9,306	15,655	147,780	186,482,000
Percent of total	81.8	7.7	89.5	3	0.4	0.4	0.5	6.2	10.5	100	
1963	127,156	12,034	139,190	4,271	859	554	753	9,866	16,303	155,493	189,278,000
Percent of total	81.8	7.7	89.5	2.7	0.6	0.4	0.5	6.3	10.5	100	
1964	141,550	13,659	155,209	5,064	819	565	785	9,277	16,510	171,719	191,851,000
Percent of total	82.4	8	90.4	2.9	0.5	0.3	0.5	5.4	9.6	100	
1965	148,965	14,448	163,413	4,856	852	589	780	9,833	16,910	180,323	193,818,000
Percent of total	82.6	8	90.6	2.7	0.5	0.3	0.4	5.5	9.4	100	
1966	160,299	15,625	175,924	4,683	747	551	632	9,817	16,430	192,354	196,843,000
Percent of total	83.3	8.2	91.5	2.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	5.1	8.5	100	
1967	174,205	17,524	191,729	4,929	729	443	704	9,732	16,600	208,329	199,118,000
Percent of total	83.6	8.4	92	2.4	0.4	0.2	0.3	4.7	8	100	

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I call this tabulation to the attention of the Senate because it shows that the filing of bankruptcies in this country is practically double today what it was about 5 or 6 years ago. This shows that the economy of this country is not as healthy as some would like to think. I am only stating

my concern over the ability of the U.S. Government to finance all of these Great Society programs on the domestic front without any curtailment while financing a full-scale war in Vietnam, all at the same time. The alternative is a prohibitive tax increase.

I happen to be one who thinks a tax

increase will be imperative. I have said that publicly many times; but I have also said, and I emphasize again, that before I would support a tax increase we must have a bona fide reduction in Government expenditures. And we are not going to get a reduction in Government expenditures until Congress starts vot-

ing less money for some of these programs.

I do not think that we as a Congress have a moral right to vote for all of these appropriations and then blame the President for not cutting back on spending. We, too, have a responsibility right here in the Senate when we answer the rollcall votes. I believe we ought to discharge that responsibility as we vote. If we want to cut appropriations let us do our part here.

If I were not voting to cut back these expenditures or to hold them down I would not criticize the President of the United States. I agree fully that we should accept our own responsibility, but at the same time, I repeat what I have said earlier, that it should be called to the attention of the President that it does not take any more ink, it does not even take a different pen, to veto an excessive spending bill than it does to approve it. I am a little impatient at hearing him tell how proud he is about how much more and more he is giving to everybody and then hearing him criticize spending, saying that the fault is with Congress, that "They made me do it." The President, too, should accept his responsibility, as well as the rest of us.

I think this pending amendment should be agreed to. I do not see how we can justify the defeat of the amendment on the basis that in this bill there is more money than we expect to retain in conference. That is a good bit like going out to sell the old mule, and saying, "Dad said to ask \$50 but if you can't get \$50 take \$25, and I think I will sell him for \$10 because that is more than he is worth."

Let the Senate put in the bill what they expect the conferees to stand on.

I am ready to vote, but first I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Delaware. Mr. President, during my colloquy with the Senator from Rhode Island, I referred to some previous proceedings. The proceedings to which I referred will be found in the September 28, 1967, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at pages S. 13851 to S. 13853. I should like to read a few portions from those pages:

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there has been widespread concern and criticism over the inadequate screening of prospective enrollees in the Job Corps. The majority leader of the Senate well expressed the problem on April 28 last year when he said:

"It was not my intention to support the establishment of three reformatories in my State."

He went on to describe the criminal activities of a Job Corps enrollee in his State and concluded by saying:

I cannot stress too strongly the need for a more careful selection of Job Corps men.

I hope that the Senator from Rhode Island will hear this statement.

I continue to read from the RECORD:

In the April 18 issue of the Oakland Tribune, an article on the Camp Parks Job Corps states that of the 7,591 young men enrolled since April 26, 1965, only 2,000 completed one or more of the courses; and of these, 1,567 have gone to work, back to school, or into the military service. Only 1,026 actually graduated from the Job Corps. The article reports:

"There is violence on the base—knifings, beatings, extortion, frequent thefts, vandal-

ism, drugs, fear, and repeated muggings. . . . The climate of terror that exists has been confirmed during many interviews with Corpsmen, counselors, teachers and even administrators for the Job Corps. . . . the director of community affairs for Camp Parks concedes that girls have been smuggled into some of the dormitories as well as liquor and marijuana."

It states in another portion of the proceedings:

Nearly half of the Job Corps enrollees have left or been discharged before completing their course, and most of these left within 3 months after enrollment. The drop-out rate of some Job Corps centers has been much higher. Certainly a better job of screening would have prevented this.

Other statistics are contained in the article.

Mr. President, I point out that this has all occurred while Sargent Shriver was Director of the Job Corps.

I must say that I think the RECORD is quite replete with examples of where a reduction of the overall Job Corps enrollees, if this amendment is agreed to, could be absorbed in two ways.

It could be absorbed by better screening and keeping out those who should not get there in the first place and whose presence there is wasting the money of the taxpayers. Second, it could be absorbed by reducing the cost of operating the Job Corps.

Mr. President, a statement was made by the Senator from Rhode Island regarding percentage depletion as a possible source of additional revenue to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I have spoken on this subject several times in the Senate. I understand it very well, and the RECORD will show what I have said about it.

I am opposed to any meat-ax approach on this subject. However, it should be pointed out that I have been here for 7 years. I have not yet seen the administration come to Congress and ask for anything to be done about this.

If this is a reasonable source of revenue, it is just a little bit late now to start talking about it.

Finally, I am concerned about holding levels of spending where they are now. I recognize that there has been some increase in the cost of living and in Government salaries and that in order to carry out programs it may be necessary to increase the appropriations a little bit over what they were for the last year.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate conferees ought to be willing to go to the conference committee with an amendment to provide for just what the Director says is necessary, \$1.788 billion, and stand firm on that.

The House has stood firm on some of its figures. I see no reason why the Senate conferees cannot stand firm on their figures, and especially if they are on solid ground.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I do not know how much experience the Senator from Rhode Island has had in these matters. I have been around here for 17 years. The Senator is oversimplifying a very hard problem. However, I am not critical of that. All I am saying is that

if the final figure is \$1.788 billion, all that would do would be to take care of the ongoing programs. It would not include the other programs that have been authorized in the recent bill.

If only that amount were appropriated, it would stop Headstart, Follow-through, day care, the provision contained in the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] to feed the very poor, and medical care for the very poor. All of those programs would have to be omitted.

They have all got to be cut down anyway for the simple reason that the authorization was below the original budget request.

The figure of \$1.788 billion, as I have explained, will only allow us to continue on the same level the programs that are now ongoing and in progress.

What I did say to the Senator from Delaware was that even if we allow the figure of \$1.98 billion, that would be subject to the 10-percent program cut and also would be subject to the 2-percent personnel fund cut.

As a matter of fact, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] moved in committee that we go to a figure of \$1.8 billion. That motion was defeated.

The only reason we are asking for this amount is to give us leeway. I have no doubt that we will not come out with the figure of \$1.98 billion. However, we are reasonable men. We want to be just as frugal as does the Senator from Iowa. However, we are asking this as a courtesy from the Senate to allow us to go to conference with the top dollar reported by the committee to meet the bottom dollar of the House, and talk about the 10-percent program cut and the 2-percent personnel fund cut and see if we cannot come out with a reasonable figure.

I do not understand why we are wasting this time.

That is what it amounts to.

I can say definitely that the administration cannot spend more than has been appropriated. If the Senator wants us to go to conference with that figure, we will not come out with it.

The Senator is asking us to explain our whole strategy, and I am afraid that by the time we get through we will not have any strategy left.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I appreciate the fairness of the Senator. I pointed out that I thought he was doing a service in presenting the matter openly. We ought to have this on the table and nothing ought to be under the table.

The Senator from Rhode Island has done that very thing, for which I commend him. However, on this side of the aisle, perhaps we have a little more confidence in the negotiating ability of the Senator from Rhode Island than he has in himself.

I think that if the Senate is right on this matter, especially if we have such an amendment approved by a very large majority so that the Senator from Rhode Island can go over there with a great amount of confidence, he will prevail on that figure.

The House conferees are reasonable. Just because they have provided \$1.6 billion should not, I think, give any Member of the Senate an excuse for suggest-

ing that they are interested in meat axing all these programs. House Members recognize that there are a great many poor people today who ought to be taken care of. I do not believe the Senate should look on the House in an unfavorable light. I myself do not.

The Senator from Delaware has performed a service. He does not stand alone. I remind the Senator from Rhode Island. There are a great many Senators on both sides of the aisle who are deeply concerned about the increasing cost of living, inflation, and higher interest rates.

Mr. PASTORE. We all are.

Mr. MILLER. But what are we going to do about it? It does not do any good to make speeches about how deplorable these conditions are unless Senators are willing to do something about them by yea-and-nay votes.

We are confronted with an anomalous situation. We are talking about programs for poor people. Yet it is the poor people who are hurt the most by the increases in the cost of living. Last year the increase in the cost of living had an impact equivalent to a 12-percent sales tax on the people of New Jersey. That might be a pretty good reason why there were some riots in Newark.

We had better make up our minds whether we are going to help the poor people; whether with the right hand we are going to help them and with the left and soak them with inflation. That inflation starts on Capitol Hill when multi-billion-dollar deficit spending takes place. That is what the Senator from Delaware is pointing out. We will not get anywhere in stopping inflation unless we do it by yea-and-nay votes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I am most sympathetic to both sides in this discussion. I know the problem faced by the Senator from Rhode Island. I know something of the problems faced by those of us who serve on the committee which considered the authorization for Office of Economic Opportunity. For instance, the programs that would be cut from the list have been carefully selected; yet we will have in the bill some good ongoing programs. But there are some other programs, I believe, that we could very well delete.

My State has a program which has received more than \$2,000,000 to provide rural legal services for those individuals who cannot afford a lawyer.

What has happened? The program has fallen into the hands of a young, apparently very bright, sociological expert who has brought suits against the Secretary of Labor and against the Governor of the State. That was not the purpose for which the Federal funds were granted. This is what is disturbing.

The Parks Job Corps camp in my State is run by one of the most efficient industrial organizations in this country, Litton Industries. I was asked to go there, having been prepared to see a finely run operation. The day before I visited the camp I learned that \$22,000

had been spent last year to pay for windows broken by trainees. These trainees, insofar as we can learn, are costing the taxpayers approximately \$11,000 each.

Each year I have objected to the high cost of this program and each year I have been told by Mr. Shriver that we are just starting out, that next year the cost will be reduced. They have a new Job Corps Director now, who, I believe, will do a good job because he is a man who will admit mistakes and attempt to correct them.

I have as much concern for the poor as anyone, as the Senator knows, but I cannot support a program which is intended to help the poor but does not due to misdirection and a lack of coordination and planning. For example, we have found that poverty workers, are being used to register voters. Obviously, this is not a priority program, but rather it is the type of situation that causes concern on this side of the aisle. yet no one on this side of the aisle, to my knowledge, wants to take away one dollar from the program if it will feed a hungry person, clothe somebody who is cold, or help train an unskilled person for a job.

These are the priority programs which must be undertaken. Instead, we have channeled too much money into ventures of dubious value.

Mr. PASTORE. We have gone into it in great detail. The Senator must realize that this is a gigantic problem.

Mr. MURPHY. It is so big that we cannot find out accurately what has happened.

Mr. PASTORE. This program will cost approximately \$2 billion. To illustrate how much that is, I am told that if you stack one thousand-dollar bills one on top of the other in order to reach \$2 billion, you will go up the height of the Washington Monument twice and have 280 inches to spare. That is a great deal of money.

It should be borne in mind that we have a population of 200 million people, and a great many people are involved.

I do not say that this is a perfect program. It is a new program, a new venture.

Our experience has been that when the attention of the administration is called to matter or the person responsible is called to account, there has been an attempt to rectify the situation. I realize that there are abuses.

Yesterday, the question of legal services came up in our committee. The American Bar Association is in favor of this program. Senator HOLLAND does not think it is a good program.

Mr. MURPHY. I thought the legal services program was a good idea, but the way it is being implemented in some areas is awful.

Mr. PASTORE. The point is that you cannot throw out the baby with the bath water.

It might be said that the way you could justify a cut of \$100 million is the way you could justify a cut of a half billion dollars or of \$1 billion. All I am saying is that this is the level of the program. I do not believe that efficiency will be promoted by cutting it down. Efficiency will be promoted by proper ad-

ministration, no matter what is appropriated. But the argument developed here today, for some reason, is that if we take out a couple of hundred million dollars it will be a better program than it is now. I cannot buy that.

Mr. MURPHY. Are you saying that, if you have a program that is not very good, it will be better if you give it more money?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not subscribe to that logic.

Mr. MURPHY. But the Senator will agree that we run into this problem continually.

One of the best programs in my State, a temporary housing program, was almost dropped. I cannot find out why. The committee had to conduct hearings around the country and spend more money in order to find out what was being accomplished because we could not find out from the director.

I am reciting this aspect because I want the RECORD to show why I object and why I have objected continually, beginning with my plea to get politics out of the program and ending with my plea to get the money designed for the poor directly to the poor. There are better ideas on how to do this and better ways to do it.

Mr. PASTORE. And we should work them out.

Mr. MURPHY. I agree.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I shall support the pending amendment. I want it clearly understood that I am not opposed to the poverty program. As Governor of the State of Wyoming, I endorsed the establishment of a Job Corps camp in Casper, Wyo. I am concerned for poor people. I shall support this program precisely because of my concern for poor people.

I believe there is a relevance between headlong inflation and poor people. It has already been pointed out in the debate that the persons who are hurt first and who suffer most are the poor people.

Let me relate to the Senate what inflation last year amounted to in terms of an additional sales tax to my people of Wyoming. The 3-percent increase in inflation last year had the same effect on the payrolls and the pocketbooks of the people of Wyoming as would have resulted from an increase in our sales tax there by 5 percent.

I am concerned about inflation and an unbalanced budget because we have voted 4½- to 6-percent salary increases for Government employees on the floor. It is easy to be in favor of economy, and it is easy to make these arguments about our concern for the poor, for the uneducated, for the people who are underprivileged. But if we are to have a balanced budget, we must get down to specifics and say how we will cut and where we will cut.

All we need do is to look at England in order to realize what can happen in America. We forget that it might happen here. England has gone through the same process. It has appropriated and has spent more money than it has taken in. It had to devalue the pound. The pre-

diction is that perhaps within 18 months Great Britain will have to institute another devaluation, and this points out the dangers inherent in appropriating more money and spending more money, year after year, than we take in. England's irresponsible lack of sound fiscal management, which our actions here parallel, has not helped the poor—it has hurt them. No one understands that more clearly than Great Britain's poor people.

These are the reasons that constrain me to support the pending amendment.

I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the position of those who favor this program and think that it should receive the full amount, and I do not question their sincerity. But those of us who are proposing this reduction, as the Senator from Wyoming has pointed out, are equally concerned. We are concerned about inflation which has a serious effect on these same people.

I call attention to another point. This is not the only program for job training or day-care centers, and so forth. Millions of dollars are included in the social security bill, upon which we will vote tomorrow, for day-care centers, millions of dollars for work training programs. These are the same types of programs that are in this bill. Many of us have believed that these programs should be consolidated into one program. When two or three bureaucracies are established too much money is going for bureaucratic salaries rather than getting down to the people who need it. I repeat, hundreds of millions of dollars involved in the other programs will be appropriated and authorized by the bills we will act on tomorrow.

So this is not the only program. It is not the only program dealing with the same people doing the same jobs.

We must also recognize that there is a question as to how far we can go, because as the small business places which are handicapped by these increased taxes go bankrupt the same people lose jobs.

Mr. President, there is a happy medium somewhere. This is only a difference of opinion as to where we reach this happy medium and what we can afford and cannot afford. I do not think that there is any question but that all of us have the same objective in mind. There may be differences of opinion as to how we can best achieve that objective. There may be differences of opinion as to how much money we can spend on this program. But we should accept it as an honest difference of opinion. I do not think there is a question in anyone's mind but that we are all seeking the best answers that we are all trying to determine what is in the best interest of the United States of America as a whole.

Mr. MILLER and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this debate, I think, has been good for everyone present. I must say I believe the Senator from Delaware has a point when he suggests that we adopt a \$1.6 billion figure, just as the House has done, so that we do not have to go to conference

on it and we would not have anything to worry about. At the same time I think it is quite clear in the face of increased government salaries and in the face of increases in the cost of living that some modest increase over that amount is necessary.

In this morning's newspapers, the OEO has come out and stated that in order to continue with the present programs they need \$1,788,000,000. This figure may possibly be subject to a 10-percent reduction or some reduction. I think there is certain discretion in the President's office on this matter. However, we should make up our minds that we are in a war, that we have the highest interest rates now since the Civil War, and that this inflation is going to go on if we do not do something about it. I suggest to my good friend from Delaware that we might be a little more realistic if the amendment could be modified to \$1,788 million, which is the amount that the OEO said it needs; then, let the Senate conferees go to the House and stand up for this. I believe that would prevail because I think most of us wish some of these programs to go on, and as long as we are on solid ground with respect to the fact that this is what the OEO needs, I think it should be given a try. I wonder if the Senator would consider that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think the amendment I offered is meritorious. It allows the same amount that the House thought necessary.

However, in the interest of compromise I would go along with that suggestion if Senators think it would be more advisable. I think we have to make a start somewhere. We cannot continue to expand these programs.

If Senators would feel better about it, I would be willing to modify the amendment accordingly.

Mr. President, in the interest of reaching an agreement, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment to read \$1,788,000,000.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. PASTORE. There is no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator makes what I am about to say very pertinent by his modification. We have not objected. We have consulted and we thought there was no use proliferating votes because if the amendment of the Senator were to be rejected, we know that he would go forward with another amendment. That is why I welcome what the Senator has done.

With respect to the figure of \$1.788 billion, I wish to state that I think I am informed on this matter. I have been through this many times because I am a member of the legislative committee and the Committee on Appropriations. In the words of the OEO, the \$1.788 billion is needed just to continue programs at last year's level. But any creativity in this antipoverty effort requires that OEO not just blindly continue old programs. That is the very thing that Members have a right to complain about. We want this program to become leaner, harder, and more effective.

Therefore, you do not want them blindly continuing what they did before, and we do not want to put them in that kind of a straitjacket.

The essential element is with respect to what the ultimate figure will be that will come out of this. I address this to the Senate. There is no more experienced Senator on appropriations than the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If we go into conference with \$1,788 million, we will come out with a much lesser figure, and that will materially harm and damage a program which is already seriously curtailed.

It is for that reason that the committee, which is very hardheaded, went along with the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], me, and others who felt we had to go in with the authorized figure, which was a lean and hard figure, based on a drastic compromise in the authorization legislation after a conference with the other body.

Mr. President, Members who support this amendment are guaranteeing a material reduction in the program in such areas as day care centers, the Job Corps, and everything that the program embraces. They should have no misunderstanding about this.

The Senate committee could ask for \$1.788 billion until it is blue in the face and it will not get it in conference if that is what it goes in with. I have been in these conferences. I can certify that fact to the Senate. If Senators want a decent compromise figure they must support the committee, because that is the only way to get it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall only take 2 minutes.

We have now made a complete circle, and we are back now to a point where we are ready to vote. First, we had the argument that if this amendment is agreed to it would destroy the entire poverty program. We are now back to the point where we are told it will not affect the program at all because it is meaningless.

Mr. President, it is not meaningless to save \$192 million. That is the amount involved in this proposal. An argument has been made that if this amendment is adopted a disaster is going to develop with Headstart or with the poverty-stricken individual who will be looking for a job. That is a smokescreen.

Why does not somebody mention that we might eliminate at least one of the high bureaucratic salaries? Let us not overlook the fact that the administrator of this poverty program and some of his associates are drawing more money in salaries than General Westmoreland draws for managing and taking charge of the war in Vietnam. There are any number of employees on the payroll of the poverty program drawing more money than mayors and some Governors of States. But nobody mentions that we might cut back on one of those items. Why? No one expresses concern over these large salaries. Those luxury jobs must be continued and expanded, and all of the punishment will be taken out down below. That is a shopworn argument. Let us not forget that these are not the only programs dealing with poverty or lack of jobs. There are day care centers, training programs, and several

welfare and relief programs under other agencies and all operating in the same general area. With the elimination of the overlapping of the high-salaried bureaucracy it would well save more than \$192 million.

The elimination of some of the graft that has been exposed in this agency would save more than the amount involved in this amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is detained on official business of the greatest importance. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 390 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Bennett	Fannin	Pearson
Bible	Hansen	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Sparkman
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Spong
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Cotton	McClellan	Symington
Curtis	Miller	Talmadge
Dirksen	Morton	Thurmond
Dominick	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—46

Anderson	Hartke	Monroney
Bartlett	Hatfield	Montoya
Boggs	Hayden	Morse
Brooke	Holland	Moss
Burdick	Hollings	Muskie
Cannon	Jackson	Pastore
Case	Javits	Pell
Church	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Clark	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Cooper	Lausche	Smith
Fong	Magnuson	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McGovern	Yarborough
Griffin	McIntyre	Young, Ohio
Harris	Metcalf	
Hart	Mondale	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Gruening	McGee
Allott	Hruska	Nelson
Baker	Inouye	Percy
Bayh	Jordan, N.C.	Prouty
Brewster	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Scott
Eastland	Long, La.	Smathers
Ellender	Mansfield	Tower

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. JAVITS moved to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I know of no further amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDING pro tempore. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On

this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is not in order. The rollcall will not proceed until there is order. Senators are not in order.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is not really Senators who are not in order, but the persons who stand around here. We have raised their salaries and still they have nothing to do but talk with each other and interfere with the business of the Senate. Something should be done about it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is well taken. The Sergeant at Arms will enforce the rule. Attaches not needed on the floor will leave the Chamber. Others will take their seats.

The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote, I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], who is absent on official business—very official business. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], and the Senator

from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 7, as follows:

[No. 391 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Anderson	Hansen	Montoya
Bartlett	Harris	Morse
Bennett	Hart	Morton
Bible	Hartke	Moss
Boggs	Hatfield	Mundt
Brooke	Hayden	Murphy
Burdick	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Nelson
Cannon	Holland	Pastore
Carlson	Hollings	Pearson
Case	Jackson	Pell
Church	Javits	Proxmire
Clark	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph
Cooper	Kennedy, Mass.	Smith
Curtis	Kennedy, N.Y.	Sparkman
Dirksen	Lausche	Spong
Dominick	Magnuson	Symington
Ervin	McCarthy	Tydings
Fannin	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McIntyre	Yarborough
Fulbright	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Miller	Young, Ohio
Griffin	Monroney	

NAYS—7

Byrd, Va.	Russell	Thurmond
Cotton	Stennis	Williams, Del.
McClellan		

NOT VOTING—25

Aiken	Hruska	Percy
Allott	Inouye	Prouty
Baker	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Bayh	Kuchel	Scott
Brewster	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Dodd	Long, La.	Talmadge
Eastland	Mansfield	Tower
Ellender	McGee	
Gruening	Mondale	

So the bill (H.R. 14397) was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized in the engrossment of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 14397) to correct any technical or clerical errors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On December 11, 1967:

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

On December 12, 1967:

S. 343. An act to provide that the Federal office building to be constructed in Detroit, Michigan, shall be named the "Patrick V. McNamara Federal Office Building" in memory of the late Patrick V. McNamara, a U.S. Senator from the State of Michigan from 1955 to 1966.

On December 13, 1967:

S. 1085. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modernize the loan and dividend provisions.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2171) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to accord with certain decisions of the courts.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10783) relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS FOR THE BENEFIT OF INDIANS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act of February 14, 1931, relating to the acceptance of gifts for the benefit of Indians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSPORTATION SERVICE BETWEEN FORT SUM- TER NATIONAL MONUMENT AND CHARLESTON, S.C.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to

law, a proposed concession contract under which Fort Sumter Tours, Inc., will be authorized to continue to operate a boat transportation service for the public between Fort Sumter National Monument and Charleston, S.C., for a ten-year period from January 1, 1968, through December 31, 1977, when executed by the Director of the National Park Service (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED COMPENSATION FOR URANIUM MINERS WHO CONTRACT CANCER FROM RADIATION

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide supplementary compensation for permanent total disability or death from lung cancer resulting from exposure to ionizing radiation in uranium mines; to provide grants to States for research and planning with respect to ionizing radiation injuries in uranium mines; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", for the fiscal year 1968, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate for appropriation.

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Limitation on Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration, Unemployment Trust Fund," for the fiscal year 1968, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 13042. An act to amend the act of June 20, 1906, and the District of Columbia election law to provide for the election of members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 942).

Mr. PROXMIRE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report, submitted earlier today by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], on H.R. 13042, be printed, together with individual views of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued December 18, 1967
For actions of December 15, 1967
90th-1st; No. 206

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....23	Economic development.....7	Fisheries.....63,75
Age discrimination.....72	Economic report.....65	Flammable fabrics.....67
Air pollution.....18,27	Economy.....9,21,35	Flood control.....59
Appalachia.....16	Education.....3,61	Food for India.....44
Appropriations.....1,78	Electrification.....12,52	Foreign aid.....1,15,78
Budgeting.....93	Employment.....72,82	Foreign trade.....53
Civil rights.....70	Extension service.....80	Forest research.....39
Commission.....62	Fair trade.....89	Forest survey.....69
Commodity reserves.5,56,92	Farm bargaining.....8	Future farmers.....45
Congressional	Farm Bureau.....42,50	Grain.....88
reorganization.....32	Farm credit.....30	Housing.....6
Consumers.....24	Farm development.....11	Information.....34
Credit.....30,48,58	Farm labor.....41	Intergovernmental
Credit unions.....66,87	Firefighters.....4	relations.....14
Disaster loans.....40	Fiscal affairs.....28	Job Corps.....20

Index continued on page 9

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to second conference report on foreign aid appropriation bill and conference report on supplemental appropriation bill. Both Houses adjourned until Jan. 15.

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. By a 69-3 Senate vote and House voice vote, both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 14397, the supplemental appropriation bill. The House rejected, 108-255, a motion to recommit the bill to conference. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S18831-3, S18969-74, H17136-48

By a 54-19 Senate vote and 198-158 House vote, both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 13893, the foreign aid appropriation bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. H17133-6, H17243-4, H17310-3, S18954-7

Sen. Hayden inserted a summary of all appropriation bills enacted in this session. pp. S18974-5

2. SOCIAL SECURITY. By a vote of 62-14, agreed to the conference report on H. R. 12080, the social security bill. The bill will now be sent to the President. pp. S18789-91, S18975-6, S18845-7, S18870-86, S19031-2
3. EDUCATION. By a 63-3 Senate vote and 286-73 House vote, both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7819, the elementary and secondary education bill. The bill will now be sent to the President. pp. H17148-78, H17240, S18949-54, S18986-99
4. PERSONNEL; FIREFIGHTERS. Passed without amendment S. 1507, to include firefighters under the law relating to retirement of Government employees engaged in hazardous occupations. pp. S18891-2
5. COMMODITY RESERVES. Sen. McGovern spoke in favor of legislation to establish reserves of agricultural commodities, and Sen. Burdick was added as a cosponsor to S. 2743, to provide for the establishment of commodity reserves by CCC. pp. S18926-8, S18831
6. HOUSING. Sens. Mondale and Sparkman inserted articles in support of S. 2700, the proposed Omnibus Housing Act of 1967. pp. S18852-5, S18903-4
Sen. Mondale commended the progress in fair housing practices and inserted several articles on this subject. pp. S18999-19008
Sen. Mondale recommended programs to help low and middle-income families in an effort to fight poverty. pp. S19027-9
7. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Kennedy, Mass., inserted his testimony on economic development by the New England Regional Commission. pp. S18855-62
8. FARM BARGAINING. Sens. McGovern and Mondale urged a program to allow farmers to bargain collectively, and Sen. Mondale expressed his intention to introduce the proposed National Agricultural Bargaining Act of 1968 when Congress reconvenes in Jan. pp. S18907-8, S18928-30
9. ECONOMY; TAXATION. Sen. Proxmire disagreed with the proposed tax increase and inserted correspondence with the Budget Bureau on this subject. pp. S18914-5
10. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. McGovern commended and inserted the report by the Office of Water Resources Research of the Interior Department. pp. S18917-20
11. FARM DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Russell inserted an article discussing a speech by Sen. Hollings on agricultural development in the U. S. p. S18941
12. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Kennedy, Mass., spoke in favor of the proposed Power Reliability Act. pp. S18942-4
13. TELEPHONE LOANS. Sen. Clark commended the telephone loan program of REA and the role it has played in providing adequate service to rural families. pp. S19026-7
14. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Sens. Mondale and Baker recommended programs to improve cooperation among Federal, State, and local governments. pp. S18961-2, S19032-5

Robison	Slack	Vanik
Rodino	Smith, Iowa	Vigorito
Ronan	Smith, N.Y.	Waldie
Rooney, N.Y.	Springer	Whalen
Rooney, Pa.	Stafford	White
Rosenthal	Stanton	Widnall
Roybal	Taft	Wilson
Ryan	Teague, Tex.	Charles H.
St Germain	Tenzer	Wolff
Scheuer	Thompson, N.J.	Wright
Schneebein	Tiernan	Wydler
Schweiker	Tunney	Yates
Schwengel	Udall	Zablocki
Selden	Ullman	
Shriver	Van Deerlin	

NAYS—158

Abernethy	Fisher	Myers
Adair	Flynt	Natcher
Anderson, Ill.	Fountain	Nelsen
Andrews, Ala.	Galifianakis	O'Konski
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gathings	O'Neal, Ga.
Ashmore	Gettys	Pettis
Baring	Goodling	Poage
Battin	Gross	Poff
Belcher	Grover	Pool
Bennett	Gubser	Price, Tex.
Berry	Hagan	Pryor
Betts	Haley	Quillen
Bevill	Hall	Randall
Blackburn	Hammer-	Rarick
Blanton	schmidt	Reid, Ill.
Bow	Hansen, Idaho	Reifel
Bray	Harvey	Rogers, Fla.
Brinkley	Henderson	Roth
Brock	Hull	Roudebush
Brown, Mich.	Hunt	Roush
Brown, Ohio	Hutchinson	Rumsfeld
Broyhill, N.C.	Ichord	Ruppe
Broyhill, Va.	Jarman	Satterfield
Burke, Fla.	Johnson, Pa.	Saylor
Burleson	Jonas	Schadeberg
Burton, Utah	Jones, Ala.	Scherle
Bush	Jones, N.C.	Skubitz
Carter	Kleppe	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Kornegay	Smith, Okla.
Chamberlain	Kyl	Snyder
Clancy	Landrum	Steed
Clausen,	Langen	Steiger, Ariz.
Don H.	Latta	Steiger, Wis.
Clawson, Del	Lennon	Stephens
Cleveland	Lipscomb	Stubblefield
Collier	Long, La.	Stuckey
Cowger	McClary	Taylor
Cramer	McClure	Thompson, Ga.
Cunningham	McCulloch	Thomson, Wis.
Curtis	McDonald,	Utt
Davis, Ga.	Mich.	Vander Jagt
Davis, Wis.	McEwen	Waggonner
de la Garza	McMillan	Walker
Denney	Marsh	Wampler
Derwinski	Meskill	Whalley
Dole	Michel	Whitener
Dorn	Miller, Ohio	Whitten
Dowdy	Mills	Wiggins
Duncan	Minshall	Williams, Pa.
Edwards, Ala.	Mize	Winn
Eshleman	Montgomery	Wyllie
Findley	Moore	Wyman
Fino	Morris, N. Mex.	Zion
	Mosher	Zwach

NOT VOTING—77

Abbott	Gray	Reuss
Adams	Griffiths	Rhodes, Pa.
Annunzio	Gurney	Roberts
Arends	Halleck	Rogers, Colo.
Ashbrook	Halpern	Rostenkowski
Bates	Hanna	Sandman
Broomfield	Hardy	St. Onge
Brown, Calif.	Harrison	Scott
Buchanan	Harsha	Shipley
Carey	Hébert	Sikes
Casey	Heckler, Mass.	Sisk
Celler	Herlong	Staggers
Colmer	Hicks	Stratton
Corbett	Hosmer	Sullivan
Dawson	Hungate	Talcott
Devine	Jones, Mo.	Teague, Calif.
Dickinson	King, N.Y.	Tuck
Dwyer	Kupferman	Watkins
Edmondson	Kuykendall	Watson
Edwards, La.	Lukens	Watts
Everett	McFall	Williams, Miss.
Evins, Tenn.	Martin	Willis
Fulton, Tenn.	Nichols	Wilson, Bob
Fuqua	Pucinski	Wyatt
Gardner	Reinecke	Young
Giallomo	Resnick	

So the conference report was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Martin against.
Mr. St. Onge for, with Mr. Harrison against.
Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Buchanan against.
Mr. Adams for, with Mr. Scott against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Watson against.
Mr. Giallomo for, with Mr. Talcott against.
Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Dickinson against.
Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Kuykendall against.
Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.
Mr. Kupferman for, with Mr. Gardner against.
Mr. Hicks for, with Mr. Gurney against.
Mr. Halpern for, with Mr. Hungate against.
Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Brown of California against.
Mr. Broomfield for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Pucinski for, with Mr. Reinecke against.
Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Sandman against.
Mrs. Griffiths for, with Mr. Talcott against.
Mr. McFall for, with Mr. King of New York against.
Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Hosmer against.
Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.
Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee against.
Mr. Bates for, with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana against.
Mrs. Dwyer for, with Mr. Everett against.
Mr. Teague of California for, with Mr. Fuqua against.
Mr. Resnick for, with Mr. Harsha against.
Mr. Reuss for, with Mr. Abbitt against.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Nichols against.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. Roberts against.
Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Devine against.
Mr. Young for, with Mr. Shipley against.
Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Sikes against.
Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Casey against.
Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Lukens against.
Mr. Hardy for, with Mr. Wyatt against.
Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Willis against.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee for, with Mr. Staggers against.
Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Tuck against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 3, line 10, insert: "Unobligated balances as of June 30, 1967, of funds heretofore made available under the authority of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, except as otherwise provided by law, are hereby continued available for the fiscal year 1968, for the same general purposes for which appropriated and amounts certified pursuant to section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, as having been obligated against appropriations heretofore made under the authority of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, for the same general purpose as any of the subparagraphs under "Economic Assistance" are hereby continued available for the same period as the respective appropriations in such subparagraphs for the same general purpose: *Provided*, That such purpose relates to a project or program previously justified to Congress and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified prior to the reobligation of funds for such projects or programs."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 6, line 8, strike out: "Provided further, That none of the funds contained in this paragraph and none of the funds contained in the military assistance credit sales revolving fund shall be used to finance directly or indirectly the purchase or acquisition of sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes, by or for any underdeveloped country (as defined on page 142 of part 2 of the printed hearings of the House Committee on Appropriations on the fiscal year 1968 Foreign Assistance Appropriations) other than Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, the Republic of China, the Philippines, and Korea:" and insert: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph (including funds used for the military assistance credit sales revolving fund) shall be used to finance directly or indirectly the purchase or acquisition of sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes, by or for any underdeveloped country, when the President finds that such funds or the recipient or purchasing country's own resources are being used for unnecessary military expenditures, to a degree which materially interferes with its development. In making such finding, the President shall take into account (1) the percentage of the recipient or purchasing country's budget which is devoted to military purposes, and (2) the degree to which the recipient or purchasing country is using its foreign exchange resources to acquire military equipment:"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds contained in this paragraph and none of the funds contained in the military assistance credit sales revolving fund shall be used to finance directly or indirectly the purchase or acquisition of sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes, by or for any underdeveloped country other than Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, the Republic of China, the Philippines, and Korea unless the President determines that such purchase or acquisition of weapons systems are vital to the national security of the United States and reports within 30 days each such determination to the Congress:"

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 9, line 13, insert:

"SEC. 106. It is the sense of the Congress that any attempt by foreign nations to create distinctions because of their race or religion among American citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access on any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens generally is repugnant to our principles; and in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this

title these principles shall be applied as the President may determine."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 15, line 12, strike out:

"SEC. 119. The President is directed to withhold economic assistance in an amount equivalent to the amount spent by any underdeveloped country (as defined on page 142 of part 2 of the printed hearings of the House Committee on Appropriations on the fiscal year 1968 Foreign Assistance Appropriations) other than Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, the Republic of China, the Philippines, and Korea for the purchase of sophisticated weapons systems such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes from any country."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 119. The President is directed to withhold economic assistance in an amount equivalent to the amount spent by any underdeveloped country other than Greece, Turkey, Iran, Israel, the Republic of China, the Philippines, and Korea for the purchase of sophisticated weapons systems, such as missile systems and jet aircraft for military purposes from any country, unless the President determines that such purchase or acquisition of weapons systems are vital to the national security of the United States and reports within 30 days each such determination to the Congress."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. From what I am hearing, this is not an appropriation bill. This is a legislative bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Are you in favor of the contents of the motion?

Mr. GROSS. I was not alluding to any one amendment. I am just hearing all kinds of legislation going through here on an appropriation bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. This is an attempt to save money. You are not objecting, are you?

Mr. GROSS. I do not object to the saving of money. I only wish you had held to the House figures, which you did not do.

Mr. PASSMAN. I will discuss it with the gentleman next year before bringing a matter of this type out.

Mr. GROSS. I wish you would do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 15, line 22, insert:

"SEC. 119. Hereafter, none of the funds obtained or authorized to be obtained from the sale of notes under authority of paragraph 111(c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 or paragraph 413(b) (4) (F) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 may be used for the purposes of discharging liabilities under any guaranties (exclusive of informational media guaranties) issued under sections 221(b) and 224 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, sections 202(b) and 413(b) (4) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and section 111(b) (3) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. Any portion of the funds in the reserve established pursuant to section 222(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which are attributable to the funds realized from the sale of notes specified in the preceding sentence shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel all such notes and sums owing and unpaid thereon, including interest to date of cancellation."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Change the section number in said amendment from "SEC. 119" to "SEC. 120".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: On page 19, line 4, insert the following: "together with \$4,500,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1967."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PASSMAN

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter upon the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14397) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement

of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceeding of the House of December 14, 1967.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

APPROPRIATION BUSINESS OF THE SESSION—SUMMARY

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as of tomorrow, 110 years ago, the House of Representatives convened in this Chamber for the first time. As for today, I join all of my colleagues in the fervent hope that this is the last day that we shall convene in this Chamber for 1967.

Mr. Speaker, the action on this bill, when completed, will conclude action on the 17 appropriation bills for this session, 2 of which have been supplemental bills for fiscal 1967.

During the year, if the present measure becomes the law, we will have appropriated, during the session—including supplementals for fiscal 1967—\$141.9 billion. When we add to this the appropriations for interest on the debt, as well as a few other items which do not require annual action, in the estimated amount of \$15.4 billion, the appropriations made in this session will total about \$157.3 billion.

But when we confine ourselves to fiscal year 1968, the appropriations total \$142.9 billion, including the estimate of \$15.4 billion for permanent appropriations.

REDUCTIONS BELOW ESTIMATES

As all Members know, we have been engaged in a fierce battle of the budget throughout this session. The ferocity was apparent even yesterday. In regular appropriation bills for the current fiscal year 1968, we have reduced appropriations below the President's budget not in the sum of \$6 billion, as had been our target, but in the sum of \$5.8 billion. The total requested, aside from permanent appropriations, was \$133.3 billion.

In addition to the \$5.8 billion reduction achieved in our regular appropriation bills for fiscal 1968, we have enacted, as the Members know, a special reduction in fiscal 1968 budgeted obligations as a rider to the continuing resolution. I shall insert in the RECORD the description of the consequences of that action which was just completed, as the Members know, on December 12. But just briefly, it was designed to assure reductions in fiscal 1968 obligations of not less than \$9 billion, inclusive of those 1968 obligations that would have been incurred under the \$5.8 billion of obligating authority cut from the appropriation bills. And this, in turn, was designed to reduce budgeted expenditures in fiscal 1968 by not less than \$4.1 billion, inclusive of perhaps as much as \$1.9 billion reduction that would ensue from specific reductions in the 15 appropriation bills for fiscal 1968.

APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL 1968 BELOW FISCAL 1967

Mr. Speaker, at this time of skyrocketing costs of Government in both new programs and expanded old programs, and at a time when war costs are soaring, I believe the Members will agree it is quite noteworthy that we have been able to reduce appropriations for the current fiscal year 1968 below appropriations made by Congress for the previous fiscal year, 1967. Appropriations for 1968 are below last year, 1967, by almost \$1.3 billion.

Except for the indefatigable efforts of the Members of the House and members of the committees on both sides of the aisle, it would not have been possible to make the reductions which I have described. I believe all Members are due a vote of thanks during these concluding hours of the session for the work which has been done to help maintain the economic stability of our country, and to solidly withstand the challenge to the dollar.

EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES, 1968

Mr. Speaker, I have been taking about appropriations. I should now like to make reference to the expenditure budget—the administrative budget. The President in January estimated that budget expenditures for this fiscal year—and the administrative budget does not include trust funds such as social security, highway funds, and so forth—would total \$135 billion. But there has been an escalation in the cost of the war; there has been an escalation in costs in certain commodity credit programs in the Department of Agriculture, in medicare, in public assistance, in veterans' programs, and others. The budget estimates on expenditures increased from \$135 billion to \$140 billion plus.

As a result of the action of Congress on regular appropriation bills, and as a result of the economy provisions attached to the continuing resolution, the reduction in spending below the \$140 billion figure will be about \$4.1 billion, as now estimated.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to indulge the patience of the Members, if I may, for an additional few moments.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been desirable, in my opinion, had Congress been able to make further reductions in Government spending at this session, faced, as we have been, with the compelling national necessity to curb spending as a result of fiscal stringencies. Woodrow Wilson once said:

The duty of economy is not debatable. It is manifest and imperative.

Mr. Speaker, the original budget deficit projection, of last January, was \$8.1 billion. In August, on the basis of certain stated assumptions and contingencies, the deficit outlook went as high as \$29 billion—a vastly changed, and worsened outlook. The more recent outlook, based on no tax increase, is \$22.4 billion—a situation drastically different, vastly more bleak than the \$8.1 billion of last January. Even with the additional expenditure reduction of some \$2.6 billion attributed to the economy provisions of the continuing resolution, the present outlook without a tax increase is a deficit of \$19.8 billion—a situation still vastly different from the original \$8.1 billion.

The executive branch should screen all programs with a view of withholding spending where good judgment and the public interest dictate such action.

A dollar spent from trust funds is just as inflationary as a dollar spent from regularly appropriated funds. Great care must be used in the curtailment of expenditures but I think it is fair to say that in seeking to achieve economies in the face of the fiscal crisis, all spending needs to be scrutinized.

In my judgment, our country will find it possible to cope successfully with the financial crisis but we can not do so if we ignore the spending picture at home and the turbulence surrounding the dollar in world financial markets following devaluation of the British pound. The President, in his continuing efforts in the direction of restraint, is seeking to bring the deficit to a more manageable level.

The law of 1950—the antideficiency law—authorizes the President to withhold funds from expenditure when conditions and circumstances have changed since the budget was made and the ap-

propriations were enacted. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Budget and the Treasury continue to be confronted with a serious situation. Every saving, from whatever source, that can reasonably and safely be made, ought to be made.

Under leave to revise and extend, I shall later incorporate more detail on the fiscal matters of the session.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON PENDING SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

In the conference report now before us, we are providing additional obligational authority, additional appropriations, in the sum of \$1,842,923,790. This is principally for the Office of Economic Opportunity—\$1,773,000,000.

There are some funds in this measure for the special Appalachia program, totalling \$57,445,750.

For the Department of the Interior the funds as provided in this conference report total \$12,200,000. There is no change from the House bill on that.

The Senate added some little additional money for housekeeping items. We acceded to those.

The Senate, in amendment 15, included \$17,247,269 to pay a number of Indian Claims Commission awards which have been finalized. The conferees representing the other body strongly supported the inclusion of this amount in the conference report and only after lengthy discussion of the item was it deleted. The President had not transmitted any supplemental requests to the Congress. Of course there were other claims and judgments eligible for appropriation consideration in addition to the Indian claims. It was not deemed appropriate to give preferential treatment to any particular category of claims at this time. It is fully expected that these items will be considered and acted upon early in the next session along with other pending claims and judgments, in the first supplemental bill.

The conference total is below the budget in this measure by something in excess of one-quarter of a billion dollars—the exact figure is \$277,861,210.

Mr. Speaker, I include a table in summarization:

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1968 (H.R. 14397)

	Appropriations, fiscal year 1967 (where applicable)	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, fiscal year 1967	Budget estimates, fiscal year 1968	House	Senate
Independent offices.....	\$59,650,000	\$60,785,000	\$54,706,500	\$64,985,000	\$57,445,750	—\$2,204,250	—\$3,339,250	+\$2,739,250	—\$7,539,250
Interior.....		(13,482,000)	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000	+12,200,000	+12,200,000		
Office of Economic Opportunity.....	1,687,500,000	2,060,000,000	1,612,500,000	1,980,000,000	1,773,000,000	+85,500,000	—287,000,000	+160,500,000	—207,000,000
Legislative.....			30,000	3,078,040	278,040	+278,040	+278,040	+248,040	—2,800,000
Claims and judgments.....				17,247,269					—17,247,269
Total.....	1,747,150,000	2,120,785,000	1,679,436,500	2,077,510,309	1,842,923,790	+95,773,790	—277,861,210	+163,487,290	—234,586,519

¹ Excludes \$4,200,000 which was requested but previously carried as budget estimates in other appropriation bills.

Note: Sundry budget estimates in the January 24th budget for 1968 that were laid aside when

the applicable regular bills for 1968 were considered because such estimates lacked legislative authorization, and which have not been considered in any subsequent appropriation bill, or this bill, aggregate \$136,797,000.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Office of Economic Opportunity, the appropriation last year was \$1,612,500,000.

There were certain carryover funds that were available which increased the availability of expenditure authority during the fiscal year 1967. Carryover funds are not available to the same degree for the fiscal year 1968. We have recom-

mended here in this report a total sum of \$1,773,000,000 for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In the authorization bill there were four new programs spelled out. One of them has to do with the high unemployment areas in the cities; the "Special Impact Programs." One has to do primarily with feeding the poor; the "Emer-

gency Food and Medical Services" program. One has to do with technical assistance by the Small Business Administration. The other has to do with day care centers.

It is true that some of this impact program had been authorized prior to this year. But this has been dealt with by the

Committees and by the Office of Economic Opportunity as a new program.

I want to make it clear that it was the intent of the conferees, when speaking of newly authorized programs, to include the four programs that I have mentioned. That would include the special impact program for the slums and ghetto areas.

I should point out that the authorizing legislation makes it mandatory that \$25 million of the appropriation be allocated to the emergency food and medical services program, and 7 percent of the appropriation for title I be allocated to the special impact programs.

We will have a provision setting aside these mandatory provisions for fiscal 1968, in view of the lateness of the year and other situations.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

In a letter I received from him only yesterday, the Director of the OEO, Mr. Shriver, specifically listed four programs as newly authorized. These are the emergency food and medicine, special impact, small business technical assistance, and day care programs. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD that letter and a table I shall refer to during the course of this discussion. These new programs are pointed out very precisely by the Director. The letter and table follow:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., December 14, 1967.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LAIRD: As I know you understand, OEO needs \$1.788 billion to con-

tinue the existing programs at present levels. This figure, however, does not reflect the new Congressional requirements or the President's recommendations. The attached sheet shows the impact of these two additional items, and may be of some help in your conference consideration.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

P.S. You were great on the "Today" show. Your philosophy of local control sounds as if you've been reading our OEO literature!

SARGE.

OEO appropriation, fiscal year 1968

[In millions]

ADDED BY NEW CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION

Needed to continue present programs at existing levels.....	\$1,788
Emergency food and medicine.....	25
Special impact (7 percent of title I).....	60
Small business technical assistance.....	10
Day care.....	25
Total	1,908

This total would not provide for the following Presidential recommendations:

Special summer programs.....	\$75
Headstart followthrough.....	125
Concentrated employment program.....	125

When the House passed this supplemental appropriation bill, we earmarked funds for the Job Corps in the amount of \$295 million, for the Neighborhood Youth Corps funds in the amount of \$321 million, for the Headstart funds in the amount of \$352 million, and for the adult employment and training program funds in the amount of \$95 million.

It is my understanding that with the higher level arrived at in the conference

report, the earmarking for these programs which the House report instructed the Director to make will be followed out in the next fiscal year. The mandatory earmarking in the authorization act that the Chairman refers to, however, must be set aside. There are only 6 months left in this fiscal year. To follow the mandatory earmarking required in the authorization bill for only a 6-month period would create a funding level for fiscal year 1969, which was not intended by the authorizing committees in either the Senate or the House.

It seems to me that the proposed language setting aside these mandatory earmarkings is absolutely necessary in view of the fact that we have only 6 months remaining in the fiscal year. The emergency food and medicine program can be adequately funded within the amount agreed to by the conferees; the mandatory level is not needed for that purpose. The special impact program would require \$60 million funded at the level of the mandatory provision, that is 7 percent of title I. Since new regulations and guidelines would have to be drawn, this \$60 million would cover only a few months and build up to an annual level that would be several times \$60 million.

When OEO Director, Mr. Shriver appeared before the committee, he submitted a table reflecting his decisions at that time on program earmarking under a \$1,788,000,000 appropriation. That earmarking would have done no more than finance programs already running during fiscal 1967; it would not have covered new programs. I will place that table in the RECORD at this point:

COMPARISON OF FISCAL YEAR 1967 ACTUAL APPROPRIATIONS WITH FISCAL YEAR 1967 ANNUALIZED AND HOUSE AUTHORIZATION BILL LEVELS, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1968 FUNDING

[New obligational authority in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1967 OEO appropriation (millions)	Fiscal year 1968 annualized at the fiscal year 1967 commitment level (millions)	Fiscal year 1968 House authorization bill (millions)	Remarks: Comparison of fiscal year 1967 appropriation with fiscal year 1968 annualized
Agency totals.....	1,687	1,788	1,600	
A. Work and training programs:				
Job Corps.....	211	295	265	\$295,000,000 required to keep Job Corps operating at end fiscal year 1967 program level. Sizable prior-year funding balances available in fiscal year 1967 will not be similarly available in fiscal year 1968.
Neighborhood Youth Corps.....	373	321	273	Fiscal year 1967 summer program levels cannot be supported in fiscal year 1968. \$321,000,000 required to refund fiscal year 1967 in-school and out-of-school programs, plus a greatly reduced summer program, in fiscal year 1968.
Adult work training.....	98	133	129	\$133,000,000 required to fund fiscal year 1967 commitments in fiscal year 1968. This level of funding is \$125,000,000 below the amount requested by the President for this essential program.
Subtotal, work and training....	682	749	667	
B. Community Action programs:				
Local Initiative.....	276	329	293	Programs funded for portion of fiscal year 1967 must now be funded for a full 12 months.
Upward Bound.....	28	35	26	Continues existing programs and funds a portion of pending applications. Required to refund in fiscal year 1968 those programs funded in fiscal year 1967; and in addition to refund fiscal year 1966 projects which did not require refunding in fiscal year 1967.
Legal Services.....	25	40	34	Refunding of some programs initiated late in fiscal year 1967 will not be needed until early in fiscal year 1969.
Comprehensive Health.....	51	42	38	Maintains fiscal year 1967 enrollment levels (the \$351,000,000 included \$15,000,000 used for summer 1966 programs; \$347,000,000 therefore annualizes \$336,000,000).
Headstart.....	351	347	301	Supports operation of pilot project for which planning grants were let in fiscal year 1967 from regular Headstart funds. President's budget for fiscal year 1968 included \$120,000,000 for this program.
Headstart follow through.....	(1)	4	14	Allows planning and limited pilot operation.
Parent-child centers.....	(1)	1	5	Staffing increases during fiscal year 1967 to carry out larger programs will need to be financed on a full-year basis, including supporting costs.
Support.....	75	69	66	
Subtotal, CAP.....	806	877	777	

Footnote at end of table.

COMPARISON OF FISCAL YEAR 1967 ACTUAL APPROPRIATIONS WITH FISCAL YEAR 1967 ANNUALIZED AND HOUSE AUTHORIZATION BILL LEVELS, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT, FISCAL YEAR 1968 FUNDING—Continued

[New obligational authority in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1967 OEO appropriation (millions)	Fiscal year 1968 annualized at the fiscal year 1967 com- mitment level (millions)	Fiscal year 1968 House authorization bill (millions)	Remarks: Comparison of fiscal year 1967 appropriation with fiscal year 1968 annualized
C. Rural loan program.....	24	20	20	Program level can be maintained through use of repayments along with NOA requested.
D. Migrants program.....	33	27	27	Lower level funding required primarily because responsibility for funding youth education projects has been transferred to HEW.
E. Work experience program.....	100	70	70	Decrease from \$100,000,000 to \$70,000,000 to be offset by proposed increases in the community work and training program under the Social Security Act.
F. General direction and administration.....	14	16	14	Staffing increases during fiscal year 1967 related to increased program level will need to be financed on a full-year basis in fiscal year 1968, including supporting cost.
G. VISTA program.....	26	29	25	To achieve 1967 man-year level of 3,287 required end-year strength of 4,259 volunteers. Maintenance of the 1967 end-year level in 1966 will require at least \$29,000,000.
H. Transfers to other agencies.....	2	-----	-----	

¹ Initiated with planning grants from regular Headstart funds, committed and obligated in fiscal year 1967.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his able contribution to the discussion. It is true that we have now provided funds above and beyond the House figure for the poverty program, and actually we have not specifically earmarked funds for any of the various programs. This gives more flexibility. Also the authorizing legislation provides certain flexibility. I believe the OEO is allowed to transfer up to 10 percent between limitations. I would think, then, that we have no earmarking problem.

The action of the conference will enable the President, within the limits provided by the authorizing legislation, to use the funds available to meet high-priority requirements to carry out an effective antipoverty program.

The responsibility in the executive branch for the operation of the Government is chiefly on the President. The appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity is carried in the budget under the heading "Funds Appropriated to the President." Of course, he has to delegate a great deal of that authority. But it is true, in my opinion, that all officials in the executive branch, including the President, should do whatever is reasonably possible to achieve the most efficient operation of Government programs, and I think it is important to lay part of that responsibility specifically on the President to do all he can in supervising the various departments and agencies—in this case the Office of Economic Opportunity—in such a way as to achieve maximum results and efficiencies in the operation of this highly controversial program—highly controversial, but yet capable of a major contribution to the public welfare.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

When the gentleman from Wisconsin referred to the earmarking in the House bill, he intimated that something comparable to these amounts would be available for the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Job Corps, and so on under the conference report. I was pleased to hear him say that, but I think he misspoke himself on one minor point, which I would like to clear up.

The gentleman referred to \$95 million for adult work and training. It was my recollection that the amount referred to is for the concentrated work and training program, which is but a small part of the adult work and training.

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. There are several work and training programs. The \$95 million was for that section of the adult work and training program that is called "community employment and training programs" by OEO.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be in favor of earmarking in these various areas, but the majority of conferees were not. There are only two items earmarked specifically now. There is \$10 million of appropriations we are making now, for the work-study program in the Office of Vocational Education. There is \$500,000 earmarked for the indemnity payments by the Department of Agriculture for milk condemned because of insecticides. Those are the only two earmarkings, although I did favor earmarking these funds as we did in the House report.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman will recall in the meeting of the Appropriations Committee on this supplemental bill, I mentioned the point of earmarking for the category of expenditure under OEO known as legal services. I had been in hopes there would be some earmarking for this. The program is very important. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the subcommittee, and I, agree this was one of the most important parts of the whole Office of Economic Opportunity program. It had been my hope there would have been some sort of earmarking. Was this considered by the conferees?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, there was budgeted for fiscal year 1966 the sum of \$47 million for that purpose, which is almost twice the amount for the

fiscal year 1967 and more than twice the amount for fiscal year 1966.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. It is my understanding, though, that this is not anywhere a sufficient amount of money to continue the program as it is contemplated. It would be my hope certainly in the future, at least, that this program would be well supported by the Congress and the administration.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to say at this time, in order that the record may be crystal clear, that we anticipate that no supplemental requests will be made. This appropriation is made with the clear understanding of the conferees that it is an appropriation to provide for the entire program for the 12 months of fiscal year 1968, and it is up to the executive branch to tailor this program and distribute these funds in such a manner as not to require funding a crisis program through a supplemental appropriation. I would say that this position is documented by the law of the land, which is aimed at preventing such additional requirements. I refer, of course, to the antideficiency law.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House have been very much interested in the action of the authorizing committee in providing for a program of emergency food and medical assistance through the Office of Economic Opportunity in cooperation with the Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare.

We are concerned that the earmarking of \$25 million for that program has been eliminated. Was it the intention of the conferees, in removing that earmarking requirement, that the funding during the remaining 6 months of this fiscal year for emergency food and medical care could be accomplished from the general appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Mr. MAHON. Whatever funds are to be expended for these four new programs, including the food and medical services program, must be funded within the framework of the \$1,773,000,000 pro-

vided. That must be made abundantly clear.

The action of the conferees in recommending and providing that there should not be a mandatory set-aside of \$25 million was taken because it seemed to be the most practical thing to do this late in the fiscal year. But this action was taken without any prejudice whatever against the emergency food and medical services program to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. With reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] there seems to be an understanding that even though there is no earmarking in this conference report the items he mentioned, such as Headstart, would have assurances that the expenditures would be at least at that level.

It is my understanding that the total of those figures the gentleman from Wisconsin spoke of would not be more than about a billion dollars. This would mean at least \$773 million over and above that could be utilized for old programs or new programs without any previous understanding of how the money would be expended.

Therefore, would it be the understanding of the gentleman from Texas that if the Director saw people living in hunger or suffering from malnutrition he could use the sums he has available to alleviate that hunger and malnutrition, under the authority given to him in the Emergency Food and Medical Services Program?

Mr. MAHON. I would say that the actions of the Director would be controlled by the authorization legislation.

I do not speak for anyone else in regard to earmarking, but that is the only earmarking of any consequence we have in this legislation.

There is no doubt in my mind that there is ample flexibility to take care of the requirement involving providing food to the hungry. There are many agencies of the Government, on many levels of Government, engaged in the business of trying to take care of the poor. The President, in his January budget message, said that of the Federal expenditures anticipated during the fiscal year more than \$25 billion would relate to meeting the requirements of the poor.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman has not answered my question yet. Let me preface my remarks by saying that now the Department of Agriculture has responsibility for feeding the poor. Also, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is involved with helping people suffering from malnutrition, through the Public Health Service. Some people have fallen through the cracks, however. Some people are living in hunger and suffering from malnutrition even though programs are available from USDA and HEW.

We have a provision in the Economic Opportunity Act which will enable the Director to transfer his funds to the

Department of Agriculture and to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in order to carry on a more extensive program to reach those people who it is said have fallen through the cracks. If the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare cannot or will not do it, the Director has the authority to move in himself, into the communities of the United States, to see the situation corrected.

I do not want the action of the conference to prejudice his ability to do that.

I would think if there is any one thing of highest priority that the general at the command post of the war on poverty would do, it is see that people are not hungry or suffering from malnutrition. That ought to be first. Even though he claims he only has money, as stated in the other body's report on their bill, to continue old programs, if people are living in hunger and suffering from malnutrition, this ought to be the first responsibility of the authorities with the money that you have given them.

My question is, Is this true, that there is nothing to prohibit the director from utilizing that authority in the emergency food and medical services program to fund them?

Mr. MAHON. There is nothing to prevent the Director from using the appropriated funds, within the limits of the authorization bill, for this purpose.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio, so that the legislative history will be clearly written on this if that is his understanding.

Mr. BOW. That is my understanding. I agree with the gentleman from Texas, if you have hungry people and the Director finds that this is so, these funds can be used to feed them.

Mr. QUIE. I would thank the gentleman further for that statement. I say again that as we look at the war on poverty and the mistakes that have been made, I think we can all agree with this one thing: The gentleman from the other body who began this legislation, when he found at first that people were suffering in his State from hunger as they were found to be suffering in other States, did a good thing and that this ought to be No. 1 on the list of programs in the war on poverty, to see that people who need food will have food and are not hungry and that people who need these medical services will get them.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. The gentleman said that there was \$47 million here for legal services. This is on the basis of a \$2 billion appropriation. This appropriation has been reduced, so instead of \$47 million there would only be \$40 million for that purpose. In view of that fact, I would like to have the chairman, if it is possible to do so, in view of the fact that the American Bar Association is so highly pleased with this program and has strongly endorsed its formation, sug-

gest to the Director, in the event it is possible to do so, to utilize as much of the funds that have been appropriated, perhaps from some other program, in order to build it up to the \$47 million that has been suggested by the chairman.

Mr. MAHON. I would say that the Director, within the framework of the authorizing legislation and within the frame work of the availability of funds, has the authority to provide for these legal requirements, but at this time we cannot anticipate the precise amount. I do not think it would be fair to undertake to make legislative history for a high funding level for legal aid at the expense of some of the other programs. They must all stand on their own footing, so to speak, in accordance with the authorizing legislation and the total amount of funds made available.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. May I just ask this further question and make this further comment: If it is at all possible for the Director to divert some sums to this legal aid program without injuring any other program, would there be objection to it?

Mr. MAHON. No. If in his judgment, without injuring any other program, he could assign additional funds for the legal aid program, there would be nothing contrary to the intent of the conferees in that action.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations yielding to me.

My question has to do with amendment No. 3. In the statement on the part of the managers for the House of the committee on conference, I notice they are reported in technical disagreement and we do plan to move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with a further amendment that will have the effect of appropriating \$160.5 million more than the House figure, albeit reducing by \$207 million from the recommendation of the other body.

This is just for a 1-year period of time, is it not?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Missouri is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the authorization as I recall the report from the legislative committee and the final action on the part of both bodies was for a 2-year period. Am I correct in stating that the committee on appropriations and its members in the conference decided to appropriate for only 1 year, although they could have appropriated for 2 years?

Mr. MAHON. We only appropriated for 1 year, and the mandatory funding levels were set aside just for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. HALL. That is the point I am getting to, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate your forthright answer. However, I am confused about the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1967 that set mandatory funding levels for programs duly authorized, were not to be effective during 1968.

Do we need the whole increase of \$160.5 million for the 6 months remaining in fiscal 1968 in order to clean up back commitments or obligations insofar as the actual expenditure budget is concerned, or should we maintain the position of the House in this respect?

Mr. MAHON. These four new programs are not prejudiced. They are still provided for in the law. The funds are not denied as a result of the conference action. However, we must point out that the entire bill, as agreed to in conference, provides for less money to continue the old programs, at the level they have already reached, than the Director of the OEO said is necessary.

Mr. HALL. I understand that, but it is still well if you use the comparable figure of \$1,733 million, as compared to what we spent in fiscal year 1967 rather than what was requested, is it not?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Missouri is correct; but both comparisons are useful.

Mr. HALL. And, I also understand, Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will yield further, because we have been operating under continuing resolutions, these programs are in effect and we must pick up this funding?

But, I would hope that the committee as a whole in accepting this might be willing to accept the House-passed figure of \$1,612,500,000 rather than the figure of \$1,773,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. I had sought, myself, as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri knows, to hold the figure to \$1.6 billion or \$1.612 billion. But the prevailing view in the conference, and apparently the prevailing view of the majority in the Congress, was to go higher. In order to resolve the differences between the House and the Senate and get a conference report, this is the best we could do.

Mr. HALL. And, it is the feeling of the distinguished chairman that there would be no further avail in going back to conference in order to attempt to hold this

figure, since one-half of the year is practically gone?

Mr. MAHON. I believe it would be of no avail to send it back. It is my opinion that we have done as well as we could do.

Mr. HALL. Would the chairman agree with me that the only way to do that would be through the adoption of a motion to recommit instructing the conferees on the part of the House to insist upon maintaining the position of the House?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Missouri is correct that this would be one way to secure reconsideration.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

THE APPROPRIATION BUSINESS, 90TH CONGRESS,
FIRST SESSION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it has been our practice at the end of each session of Congress to place in the RECORD various résumés of the business of the session. Under leave, I am at this point providing a résumé of the appropriation business for the session.

With the lateness of the session and with appropriation bills pending in the final hours, I must say this should to a limited extent be considered subject to some refinement of detail.

THE BUDGET AS POINT OF DEPARTURE

This has been an unusual year, Mr. Speaker. The session has been long and arduous, most particularly so with regard to fiscal affairs. This was partly due to the various contingencies, such as proposed tax surcharge, incorporated in the budget which was submitted to us on January 24, 1967.

The Federal Budget is perhaps the most complex and comprehensive annual fiscal document put together anywhere in the world. It is far more than an accumulation of figures. It is a program for action. It is an expression of plans and aspirations. Once the budget is assembled and delivered, it is the responsibility of Congress to consider and dispose of the various elements of the plan as Con-

gress may decide. The items included in the budget are primarily those previously authorized by law. There are, of course, items which are new and which are included for financing in the budget based on the contingency of being authorized by a new act of Congress. Let me at this point repeat what I have said previously: that the budget is more than a proposal for new appropriations. It is more than a proposal for Federal spending. It involves the whole gamut of the national economy. The revenue proposals are as significant—and sometimes more immediately significant—to the individual taxpayer and businessman as are the spending proposals.

Mr. Speaker, last January 24 when the budget was presented to us, I placed in the RECORD a tabulation of the possible effect of the failure of several of the major contingencies that were presented, particularly on the revenue side of the budget. At page H545 of the RECORD of January 24, 1967, there is a table which shows that without the proposed surtax; without the postage rate increase; without the proposal to further accelerate corporate tax payments and without congressional authority for the so-called participation certificate method of financing, the deficit for 1968 could have been projected at that time to be \$19.3 billion. As you know, the tax proposals have not been enacted. The postage rate increase was enacted, but with a later effective date. Congress did provide for the participation certificate program.

Subsequent to the January budget and during the session, many other fiscal and economic considerations came to bear with the result that during the year revised estimates of possible deficits ranged all the way from the original \$8.1 billion to the possibility, based on various contingencies, of a \$29 billion deficit. As it now stands, the administrative budget deficit is projected to be approximately \$19.8 billion. I include a table showing the various figures:

ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET DEFICIT, FISCAL YEAR 1968

[In billions]

Item	January budget	Aug. 3 revision	Nov. 29 revision	Item	January budget	Aug. 3 revision	Nov. 19 revision
Estimated receipts:				Estimated deficit with tax increase.....	\$8.1	\$14.0	\$13.7
Estimated receipts with tax increase.....	\$126.9	\$122.5	\$122.5	Estimated deficit without tax increase.....		20.1	19.8
Estimated receipts without tax increase.....		116.4	116.4	Possible other adjustments (memorandum):			
Estimated expenditures.....	135.0	136.5	140.3	Increased cost Vietnam war.....		(+4.0)	
Changes made by Congress (13 appropriation bills).....			1-1.5	Excess of pay increase.....		(+1.0)	
Additional changes by Congress and administration.....			-2.6	Failure PC sales.....		(+2.0)	
Net estimated expenditures.....	135.0	136.5	136.2	Maximum deficit.....		(27.1)	

¹ Does not reflect the effects of final action on the last 2 appropriation bills, which cleared Congress today (foreign assistance and final supplemental).

BACKGROUND FOR SPENDING

Mr. Speaker, let me attempt to set the record straight with respect to the source of spending. As most Members know, a large part of the actual spending in any given fiscal year results from appropriations or other obligational authority enacted by Congress in the year or years just preceding. To a very considerable extent this was the situation in fiscal 1968. As I stated in January in a rather preliminary statement anticipating the 1968 budget:

It is all very easy to talk about how we are going to cut spending. And we must and we will, but when it comes to individual cases we are going to find that talk is cheap but action is at times rather expensive and painful. If we are going to do a good job in fiscal matters, we are going to have to gird ourselves for the contest because there will be many distractions and obstacles along the way. I make that statement especially because the area of the budget that can be cut substantially is somewhat narrow. We all agree that we probably cannot drastically cut the Defense requests, and they will certainly be in excess of \$70 billion. We provided more

than that this year. Certainly for the forthcoming fiscal year, it will be considerably more. We cannot sidestep the interest on the debt, which is some \$14 billion more. Those two areas may run the total up close to \$90 billion. Then we probably will appropriate the necessary money for the Veterans' Administration, which is above \$6 billion. We can go and find that, while it is theoretically possible to make reductions in such programs as these, as a practical matter no substantial net reductions can be expected in large chunks of money which are devoted to defense, interest, veterans payments and certain other categories. But

there are fields in non-defense spending where major cuts can be made.

Spending results from the making available of obligational authority. Under the rules, no appropriation is in order unless the object for which the appropriation is made has been authorized previously by law. Thus restraint in spending is the responsibility not solely of the Committee on Appropriations but of all committees and in fact all of the Congress generally. Processing the budget is the work of many hands and product of the minds of all Members.

The spending situation in which we found ourselves this year results in large measure from the fact that budget spending for fiscal year 1967 had increased sharply from \$107 billion in 1966 to \$126.7 in 1967. It is now estimated to be \$136.2 billion in 1968. Increases in revenues have not kept pace with the increase in spending. Nonetheless, newly authorized programs have provided generally for even greater spending. By way of emphasizing this point and to demonstrate the impact of new spending authorizations from previous years on any given budget, I would like to quote from a statement which I made on the fiscal 1968 budget, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1967, page H539.

Two years ago we increased appropriations over the previous year by some \$13 billion. Last year, we increased appropriations over the previous year by nearly \$25 billion. This year, we are being requested to increase appropriations over last year by roughly \$21 billion. So we can see how rapidly appropriations have escalated in the last 2 years and what we are confronted with in our considerations during this session.

Once appropriations are made expenditures naturally follow.

Mr. Speaker, the culmination of the congressional concern over expenditures and deficits was the recent enactment of the continuing resolution, House Joint Resolution 888, with its provision for withholding obligational authority and expenditures in fiscal year 1968.

I shall have more to say on this later. My point in devoting this much space to revenues, expenditures, and deficits is simply to say that it seems to me that we cannot continue to provide more and larger programs involving expenditure of Federal funds without either a sharp increase in Federal revenue or facing up to curtailing otherwise desirable Federal programs.

It is true that the war in Vietnam contributes heavily to the drain on the Treasury. The current estimates for 1968 expenditures indicate a \$2 billion increase over the estimated expenditures of \$21.9 billion for the war in Vietnam projected in the original budget last January.

Up to this point I have been referring, for the most part, to spending in terms of cash outgo or expenditures. It is the level of expenditures as related to the level of revenues which determines the deficit or surplus in a given year, but the control of the expenditure side is accomplished largely through control over the appropriations. No money can

be spent without an appropriation, and there are a number of legislative methods for appropriating money, but the bulk of this money is provided through the regular annual appropriation process.

THE APPROPRIATION BILL TOTALS

At this session we have enacted 14 regular appropriation bills and three supplemental appropriation bills. Two of the three supplementals were for fiscal 1967. So we generally refer to 15 appropriation bills for fiscal 1968. The last two of these bills were acted upon here today.

Let me give a brief résumé of appropriations provided at this session:

To begin with there were the two fiscal 1967 supplemental appropriations totaling \$14,394,451,417, most of which was for support of the Vietnam war.

HOUSE TOTALS

In the 15 appropriation bills for fiscal 1968, the House considered estimates totaling \$133,040,228,004. The House initially approved in these 15 bills total appropriations of \$126,944,364,206, a reduction of \$6,095,863,798 below the estimates considered.

SENATE TOTALS

The Senate considered estimates totaling \$133,273,083,277 in these 15 appropriation bills—\$232,855,273 higher than the estimates considered by the House,

as a result of a few budget amendments going directly to the Senate—and initially approved appropriations totaling \$131,015,134,124, a reduction of \$2,257,949,153 below the estimates considered. While the Senate first passed these 15 bills containing \$4,070,769,918 more than the House had approved, it must be noted that the Senate also considered estimates which were higher than the estimates considered by the House.

The Senate reduced three of the 15 bills below what the House had provided.

FINAL TOTALS

Final action on these 15 appropriation bills by both Houses of the Congress resulted in appropriations totaling \$127,477,895,247, for a reduction of \$5,795,188,030 below the budget requests. Including estimates in the amount of \$136,797,000 which the committee did not consider, the total decrease below the total estimates submitted is \$5,931,985,030. This is not an insignificant accomplishment, Mr. Speaker, which will result in reduced expenditures for at least the next 3 years, including approximately \$1.9 billion for fiscal 1968. A dollar not appropriated is a dollar that cannot be spent—this year, next year, or beyond.

I include a summary of the appropriation totals for the session, as follows:

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION BILL TOTALS, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF DEC. 15, 1967

[Does not include any "back-door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills. All figures are rounded amounts]

	Bills for fiscal 1967	Bills for fiscal 1968	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered...	\$14,411,000,000	²³⁴ \$133,040,000,000	⁴ \$147,451,000,000
2. Amounts in 17 bills passed by House.....	14,238,000,000	²³ 126,945,000,000	141,183,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests.....	-173,000,000	⁴ -6,095,000,000	⁴⁵ -6,268,000,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered...	14,533,000,000	²³⁴ 133,273,000,000	⁴ 147,806,000,000
2. Amounts in 17 bills passed by Senate.....	14,457,000,000	²³ 131,015,000,000	145,472,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests.....	-76,000,000	⁴ -2,258,000,000	⁴⁵ -2,334,000,000
4. Compared with House amounts in these 17 bills.....	+219,000,000	+4,070,000,000	+4,289,000,000
C. Final actions:			
1. Budget requests for "appropriations" considered...	14,533,000,000	²³⁴ 133,273,000,000	⁴ 147,806,000,000
2. Amounts approved in 17 bills enacted.....	14,394,000,000	²³ 127,478,000,000	141,872,000,000
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests.....	-139,000,000	⁴ -5,795,000,000	⁴⁵ -5,934,000,000

¹ Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about \$15,212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968.

² Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget, \$980,000,000; House bill, \$925,000,000; Senate bill, \$955,000,000; enacted, \$925,000,000) and for grants-in-aid for airports (budget, \$75,000,000; House bill, \$65,000,000; Senate bill, \$75,000,000; enacted, \$70,000,000).

³ And participation sales authorizations as follows: Total authorizations requested in budget, \$4,300,000,000; total in House bills, \$1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, \$4,085,000,000; total enacted, \$4,250,000,000.

⁴ Excludes \$136,797,000 budget estimates not considered in any appropriation bill.

⁴⁵ If the \$136,797,000 of estimates not considered were also counted, these figures would be that much greater.

Prepared Dec. 15, 1967, in the House Committee on Appropriations.

I should add, Mr. Speaker, that to reconcile these appropriation figures with the budget document it is necessary to convert from "appropriations" to "obligational authority," a relatively slight difference, and to convert appropriations for the Post Office Department from a gross basis to a net basis, a difference of perhaps about \$6 billion.

CHARACTER OF APPROPRIATIONS INCREASES, LAST THREE SESSIONS

Mr. Speaker, total appropriations during this session of Congress are roughly

\$13,400,000,000 over total appropriations during last session. Of this \$13,400,000,000 increase, all but about \$1,300,000,000 is in national defense. National defense appropriations are up by \$12,100,000,000.

The increase of \$1,300,000,000 in non-defense appropriations this session is about the same as the increase in non-defense appropriations in the second session of the 89th Congress over the first session of the 89th Congress.

NET APPROPRIATION CHANGES, BY SESSIONS

[In billions of dollars]

	Total	National defense	Nondefense
89th Cong., 1st sess., over 88th Cong., 2d sess. (from \$106,-100,000,000 to \$119,300,000,000).....	+ \$13.2	+ \$0.2	+ \$13.0
89th Cong., 2d sess., over 89th Cong., 1st sess. (from \$119,-300,000,000 to \$143,900,000,000).....	+24.6	+23.3	+1.3
90th Cong., 1st sess., over 89th Cong., 2d sess. (from) \$143,-900,000,000 to \$157,300,000,000).....	+13.4	+12.1	+1.3

THE ECONOMY RESOLUTION—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 888

I have given you the figures relating to the normal processing of the regular annual appropriation bills for fiscal year 1968, but, as you know, an unusual economy provision was enacted this year as a part of the final continuing resolution—House Joint Resolution 888. That resolution provided for reductions in obligating authority in the more controllable civilian programs, and in defense program not related to Vietnam, in amounts of 2 and 10 percent. While there is a certain amount of administrative leeway in the measure, it is generally estimated to reduce obligation authority by \$9 billion, plus inclusive of the reductions resulting formations in the individual appropriation bills. And, in turn,

budgeted expenditures are generally estimated to be reduced by \$4.1 billion, inclusive of reductions that would result from actions in the individual appropriation bills.

The economy resolution—on which final action by Congress was achieved on December 12—in simplest terms, provides that departments and agencies shall be limited to the lesser amount of obligational authority provided by—

First. The applicable appropriation act for 1968; or

Second. The budget estimates for 1968, less a sum equal to a 2-percent cut in budgeted personnel compensation and a 10-percent cut in other items.

Third. There are certain classes of exemptions, briefly: First, permanent appropriations—interest on the debt and

so forth; second, trust funds—the social security program and the like; third, “relatively uncontrollable” items as described on page 14 of the budget—veterans benefits, and so forth; fourth, an overall authority to exempt up to \$300 million of programs on Presidential finding of vital necessity; and fifth, defense obligations and expenditures are subject to special provisions. The reduction is to be 10 percent on budgeted obligations for other than Vietnam costs, with the further provision that any obligations for national defense purposes may be exempted from the limitation upon Presidential determination of essentiality.

This is the largest reduction in obligational authority by way of appropriation action since fiscal year 1954 when Congress reduced the last Truman budget by \$12 billion plus. The ending of the Korean war was instrumental in making this possible.

In summary form, the following table compares obligation and expenditure estimates in the January budget as revised in August, the total estimates on November 29, the 2- and 10-percent reductions, and the revised estimates:

1968 OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES (JANUARY BUDGET AS REVISED NOV. 29)

[In billions of dollars]

	January budget as revised in August		Additional estimated requirements		Total requirements		Reduction by 2- to 10-percent provisions		Revised estimate	
	Obligations	Expenditures	Obligations	Expenditures	Obligations	Expenditures	Obligations	Expenditures	Obligations	Expenditures
Controllable civilian programs.....	38.4	22.2	—0.3	-----	38.1	22.2	—3.6	—2.1	34.5	20.1
Defense non-Vietnam.....	54.1	50.4	-----	-----	54.1	50.4	—5.4	—2.0	48.7	48.4
Foreign assistance military.....	.6	.8	-----	-----	.6	.8	—1.1	-----	.5	.8
Subtotal.....	93.1	73.4	—3	-----	92.8	73.4	—9.1	—4.1	83.7	69.3
Defense Vietnam.....	20.8	21.9	+3.0	+2.0	23.8	23.9	-----	-----	23.8	23.9
Uncontrollable civilian programs.....	30.5	45.5	+1.7	+1.7	32.2	47.2	-----	-----	32.2	47.2
Participation sales public enterprise funds, etc.....	1.1	—4.3	-----	-----	1.1	—4.3	-----	-----	1.1	—4.3
Total.....	145.5	136.5	+4.4	+3.7	149.9	140.2	—9.1	—4.1	140.8	136.1

¹ See the following table:

[In millions of dollars]

	Amount
CCC: Price support program.....	672
HEW:	
Payments to trust funds for health insurance.....	217
Public assistance grants.....	475
Treasury: Interest of public debt.....	200
VA: Compensation, pensions, and insurance.....	127
All other.....	49
Total.....	1,740

² These figures vary slightly from Budget Bureau tables due to rounding.

³ These figures do not include an estimated additional \$544,000,000 of expenditures which would be in the picture if Congress fails to enact certain legislation proposed in the January budget, as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	Amount
Defense Production Act (cancel interest on Treasury borrowings).....	53
REA revolving fund and user charges.....	213
Interior, power marketing revolving funds.....	78
Beauty-safety activities and forest and public land highways.....	171
Treasury, mint revolving fund.....	22
Interfund transaction adjustments (net).....	7
Total.....	544

The estimated expenditure changes made by Congress during the session are summarized by department and major agency below. It should be borne in mind

that both the preceding and following tables were calculated before final Congressional action on the final two appropriation bills, however, necessary sub-

sequent adjustment should be relatively minor:

CONTINUING RESOLUTION (H.J. RES. 888)—ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

Agency	Fiscal 1968 administrative budget expenditures, (executive estimates, Nov. 29, 1967)	Estimate of expenditure changes made by appropriation bills	Expenditure reductions, H.J. Res. 888, above changes made in appropriation bills	Agency	Fiscal 1968 administrative budget expenditures, (executive estimates, Nov. 29, 1967)	Estimate of expenditure changes made by appropriation bills	Expenditure reductions, H.J. Res. 888, above changes made in appropriation bills
Legislative branch.....	269,564	—400	-----	Health, Education, and Welfare.....	12,938,980	—45,800	—364,200
Judiciary.....	95,887	—2,300	-----	Housing and Urban Development.....	607,696	—40,000	—100,000
Executive Office of the President.....	28,204	+2,300	(1)	Interior.....	1,661,263	—41,800	—18,200
Funds appropriated to the President.....	5,089,202	—400,000	-----	Justice.....	450,796	—7,500	—2,500
Department of Agriculture.....	7,152,805	—56,000	—234,000	Labor.....	555,780	—11,200	—3,800
Department of Commerce.....	998,865	—32,700	—2,300	Post Office.....	606,218	—58,000	—2,000
Defense, military.....	74,300,000	—688,000	—1,312,000	State.....	422,866	—3,200	—6,800
Defense, civil.....	1,465,101	—8,000	—27,000	Transportation.....	1,503,660	—74,700	—10,300

Footnote at end of table.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION (H.J. RES. 888)—ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE REDUCTIONS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Agency	Fiscal 1968 administrative budget expenditures, (executive estimates, Nov. 29, 1967)	Estimate of expenditure changes made by appro- priation bills	Expenditure reductions, H.J. Res. 888, above changes made in appropriation bills	Agency	Fiscal 1968 administrative budget expenditures, (executive estimates, Nov. 29, 1967)	Estimate of expenditure changes made by appro- priation bills	Expenditure reductions, H.J. Res. 888, above changes made in appropriation bills
Treasury	15,345,880	-6,600	-23,400	Special allowances:			
Atomic Energy Commission	2,385,000	-3,000	-77,000	Pay increases	1,000,000		
General Services Administration	710,480	-7,300	-27,700	Shortfall in asset sales	750,000		
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	5,300,000	-385,000	-90,000	Contingencies	300,000		
Veterans' Administration	6,330,000	-1,800	-78,200	Total	140,272,508	-1,899,000	-2,411,000
Other independent agencies	559,458	-22,000	-181,600	Adjusted to reflect estimates on 2 appropriations not yet passed:			
District of Columbia	126,760	-6,000	(¹)	OED (final supplemental, rough approxima- tion)		-200,000	+80,000
Interfund transactions	-681,957			Foreign assistance (rough approximation)		-200,000	+130,000
Sec. 203(4) (the \$300,000,000 obligation exemp- tion reserve)			+150,000	Adjusted total (total, \$4,100,000,000)		-1,499,000	-2,621,000

¹ Reflected in figures for other independent agencies.

DELAYS IN APPROPRIATION BILLS

I have said that no appropriation is in order unless its object has been authorized by law. Thus the appropriation bills are geared to the legislative authorizing process.

The committee's original reporting plan, released on April 10, was to bring all of the regular annual bills for fiscal 1968 to the House during the period March 20 to June 30. The last one, for the new Department of Transportation, was scheduled to be reported on June 30.

The first nine bills for 1968 were reported on schedule, but all the others were either wholly or in significant part delayed for lack of more timely enactment of a number of related annual authorization bills.

The public works bill was scheduled to be reported to the House on June 16 but was not actually reported until July 20. Action on this appropriation bill was delayed for lack of authorization primarily for the Atomic Energy Commission. The authorizing legislation—Public Law 90-56—was enacted into law July 26, 1967.

The transportation appropriation bill was scheduled for reporting to the House on June 30 but experienced a slight delay

until July 13, 1967, pending authorization for the Coast Guard which was signed into law—Public Law 90-37—June 30, 1967.

The appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was originally scheduled for inclusion in the independent offices-HUD bill which was reported to the House on May 22, but because of lack of authorization, the NASA appropriation was processed as an individual bill and was reported to the House on August 18. The NASA authorization—Public Law 90-67—was signed into law on August 21, 1967.

The military construction appropriation bill was originally scheduled for reporting to the House on June 16, but because of lack of authorization was not actually reported until October 19, 1967. The military construction authorization—Public Law 90-110—was signed into law October 21, 1967.

The foreign assistance appropriation bill was scheduled for reporting to the House on June 23 but was not actually reported until November 6, 1967. Once again, the delay was caused by the lack of authorization. The necessary authorization—Public Law 90-137—was signed

into law November 14, 1967. Funding for the Peace Corps was included in the foreign assistance appropriation bill under special permission granted by the House since the Peace Corps authorization—Public Law 90-175—was not signed into law until December 5, 1967.

The appropriation of funds for the economic opportunity program was originally scheduled to be included in the Labor-HEW bill, but because of lack of authorization, it was necessary to defer action on the budget estimate. The authorizing legislation was cleared by the Congress on December 11, 1967; the Appropriations Committee reported the related appropriation to the House in the supplemental appropriation bill for 1968 the next day, December 12.

Another activity for which appropriation action was delayed pending the enactment of authorization was the Appalachian program. The authorizing legislation—Public Law 90-103—was signed into law October 11, 1967. The related appropriations were included in the supplemental appropriation bill for 1968 which was reported to the House on December 12, 1967, as follows:

MAJOR RECURRING LEGISLATIVE AUTHORIZATION BILLS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968 (WHICH, UNDER THE RULES, MUST PRECEDE THE RELATED APPROPRIATION BILLS)

Bill	Current authorization bills				Corre- sponding appropri- ation bill reported to House 90th Cong., 1st sess.	Date and law number, similar authorizations in previous Congress							
	Passed House	Passed Senate	Confer- ence report finally adopted	Signed into law 90th Cong., 1st sess.		89th Cong.		88th Cong.		87th Cong.		86th Cong.	
						2d sess.	1st sess.	2d sess.	1st sess.	2d sess.	1st sess.	2d sess.	1st sess.
	1967	1967	1967	1967	1967	1966	1965	1964	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959
Armed Forces, procurement, R.D.T. & E. (S. 666)-----	May 9	Mar. 21	May 23	90-22 June 5	June 9	89-501 July 13	89-37 June 11	88-288 Mar. 20	88-28 May 23	87-436 Apr. 27	87-53 June 21		
Armed Forces, military construction (H.R. 11722)-----	Aug. 1	Sept. 25	Oct. 4	90-110 Oct. 21	Oct. 19	89-568 Sept. 12	89-188 Sept. 16	88-390 Aug. 1	88-174 Nov. 7	87-554 July 27	87-57 June 27	86-500 June	86-149 8Aug. 10
Coast Guard (H.R. 5424)-----	Apr. 12	June 12	-----	90-37 June 30	July 13	89-381 Mar. 30	89-13 Apr. 20	88-281 Mar. 11	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
NASA (S. 1296)-----	June 28	June 28	Aug. 8	90-67 Aug. 21	Aug. 18	89-528 Aug. 5	89-53 June 28	88-369 July 11	88-113 Sept. 6	87-584 Aug. 14	87-98 July 21	86-481 June 1	86-45 June 15
Atomic Energy Commission (H.R. 10918)-----	June 29	July 12	-----	90-56 July 26	July 20	89-428 May 21	89-32 June 2	88-332 June 30	88-72 July 22	87-701 Sept. 26	87-315 Sept. 26	86-457 May 13	86-44 June 11
Foreign assistance (S. 1872)-----	Aug. 24	Aug. 17	Nov. 8	90-137 Nov. 14	Nov. 6	89-583 Sept. 19	89-171 Sept. 6	88-633 Oct. 7	88-205 Dec. 16	87-565 Aug. 1	87-195 Sept. 4	86-472 May 14	86-108 Jul. 24
Peace Corps (S. 1031)-----	Nov. 21	May 15	-----	90-175 Dec. 5	do	89-572 Sept. 13	89-134 Aug. 24	88-285 Mar. 17	88-200 Dec. 13				
Economic Opportunity (S. 2388)-----	Nov. 15	Oct. 5	Dec. 11	-----	Dec. 12	89-794 Nov. 8	89-253 Oct. 9	88-452 Aug. 20					
National Teacher Corps (H.R. 10943)-----	June 27	June 28	-----	90-35 June 29	Oct. 31								
Appalachian Regional Development Act(S. 602)-----	Sept. 14	Apr. 27	Sept. 29	90-103 Oct. 11	Dec. 12		89-4 Mar. 9						

¹ Funds added to Labor-HEW bill in Senate (1st reported to House in conference report). Teacher Corps previously authorized as part of a broader education bill.

Mr. Speaker, I append a table listing the totals involved in each of the 17 appropriation bills of the session:

SUMMARY OF ACTION ON BUDGET ESTIMATES OF "APPROPRIATIONS" IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF DEC. 15, 1967

[Does not include any "back door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	Budget estimates considered by House	Passed House	Budget estimates considered by Senate	Passed Senate	Enacted	Latest action compared to budget (+) or (-)
Bills for fiscal 1968:						
Treasury-Post Office.....	\$7,613,787,000	\$7,499,230,000	\$7,615,148,000	\$7,555,167,000	\$7,545,641,000	-69,507,000
District of Columbia:						
Federal payments.....	63,499,000	59,499,000	73,499,000	71,499,000	67,478,200	-6,020,800
Federal loan appropriation.....	49,600,000	48,100,000	89,700,000	79,200,000	79,200,000	-10,500,000
Interior.....	1,443,793,000	1,365,310,150	1,458,218,000	1,399,359,550	1,382,848,350	-75,369,650
Loan and contract authorizations.....	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(16,200,000)	(-14,500,000)
Independent offices—HUD.....	² 10,804,642,700	² 10,013,178,782	² 10,820,513,700	² 10,514,830,900	² 10,139,473,900	-681,039,800
Contract authorization (rent supplements).....	(40,000,000)		(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(-30,000,000)
Labor-HEW.....	³ 13,322,603,000	³ 13,137,488,000	³ 13,424,146,000	13,421,660,000	³ 13,255,356,000	-168,790,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary.....	⁴ 2,342,942,000	⁴ 2,194,026,500	⁴ 2,347,803,195	⁴ 2,186,105,500	⁴ 2,169,012,500	-178,790,695
Legislative.....	231,311,132	228,089,952	276,005,210	275,885,804	275,699,035	-306,175
Agriculture.....	⁵ 5,021,097,400	⁵ 4,770,580,950	⁵ 5,021,097,400	⁵ 4,952,945,700	⁵ 4,952,945,700	-68,151,700
Loan authorization.....	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(909,000,000)	(859,600,000)	
Defense.....	71,584,000,000	70,295,200,000	71,584,000,000	70,132,320,000	69,936,620,000	-1,647,380,000
Transportation.....	⁶ 1,718,618,772	⁶ 1,530,198,372	⁶ 1,718,618,772	⁶ 1,651,407,272	⁶ 1,581,905,772	-136,713,000
Public works.....	4,867,813,000	4,622,922,000	4,867,813,000	4,776,064,000	4,689,938,000	-177,875,000
NASA.....	5,100,000,000	4,583,400,000	5,100,000,000	4,678,900,000	4,588,900,000	-511,100,000
Military construction.....	2,937,000,000	2,142,693,000	2,937,000,000	2,099,350,000	2,093,362,000	-843,638,000
Foreign assistance.....	3,818,736,000	2,775,011,000	3,818,736,000	3,313,345,000	2,876,591,000	-942,145,000
Supplemental (poverty, Appalachia, etc.).....	⁶ 2,120,785,000	1,679,436,500	⁶ 2,120,785,000	2,077,510,309	1,842,923,790	⁶ -277,861,210
Subtotal, 1968 bills.....	133,040,228,004	126,944,364,206	133,273,083,277	131,015,134,124	127,477,895,247	⁶ -5,795,188,030
Bills for fiscal 1967:						
Defense supplemental (Vietnam).....	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	12,196,520,000	-79,350,000
2d supplemental.....	2,134,932,833	2,041,826,133	2,257,604,652	2,260,246,933	2,197,931,417	-59,673,235
Subtotal, 1967 bills.....	14,410,802,833	14,238,346,133	14,533,474,652	14,456,766,933	14,394,451,417	-139,023,235
Cumulative "appropriation" totals for the session:						
House (17 bills).....	147,451,030,837	141,182,710,339				⁶ -6,268,320,498
Senate (17 bills).....			147,806,557,929	145,471,901,057		⁶ -2,334,656,872
Enacted (17 bills).....			147,806,557,929		141,872,346,664	⁶ -5,934,211,265

¹ Permanent "appropriations" were tentatively estimated in January budget at about \$15-212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968. (All forms of permanent "new obligatory authority" for 1968 were tentatively estimated in the January budget at \$17,452,899,000.)

² Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget, \$980,000,000; House bill, \$925,000,000; Senate bill, \$955,000,000; enacted \$925,000,000).

³ And participation sales authorizations as follows: Independent Offices-HUD, \$3,235,000,000 in budget estimates, \$881,000,000 in House bill, \$3,235,000,000 in Senate bill, and \$3,235,000,000 enacted; Labor-HEW, \$115,000,000 in budget estimates, House bill, and enacted; State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary, \$150,000,000 in budget estimates, House bill, Senate bill, and enacted;

Agriculture, \$800,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill, \$700,000,000, in Senate bill and \$750,000,000 enacted. Total authorizations requested in budget, \$4,300,000,000; total in House bills, \$1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, \$4,085,000,000; total enacted, \$4,250,000,000.

⁴ Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for grants-in-aid for airports (budget, \$75,000,000; House bill, \$65,000,000; Senate bill, \$75,000,000; enacted \$70,000,000).

⁵ Excludes \$136,797,000, budget estimates not considered in any appropriation bill.

⁶ If the \$136,797,000 of estimates not considered were also counted, these figures would be that much greater.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, who has contributed mightily to our work on appropriation bills at this session of Congress.

Mr. BOW. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas yielding to me at this point.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman's yielding to me. I rise in support of this conference report.

The concept embodied in the report of the conference to provide a maximum level of appropriation of \$1,773,000,000 without earmarking the funds is sound.

This will enable the Director to establish priorities with the limits of the authorizing legislation and the appropriation contained in the report.

This will insure that both the ongoing programs and those new programs authorized in the legislation recently passed can both be funded if the Director makes the determination.

Among those new programs for which an authorization was provided is one which I believe deserves priority. That is the technical assistance program established in section 406 of title IV for which

an authorization of \$10 million was provided.

I have called to the attention of my colleagues the critical importance of this program. I have stated that this section of the legislation is the one portion which gives real meaning to the words "economic opportunity."

I would urge that the Director give careful and serious consideration to the latitude given to him by this conference report in order for him to recognize the value and validity of the title IV amendment contained in section 406.

I recognize fully the limit of funds within which the Director must operate and share the concern of my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. QUIEL], for the need for action under the emergency food and medical services program.

There were a number of new programs authorized by this Congress in the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1967. Under the provisions of the conference report they can be given a fair chance to stand on their own merits.

The total needs of our society are great and I have confidence that this conference report will allow the needs to be judged on an equitable basis.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I shall address myself only to the conference report now pending before the House of Representatives, and say that I am in favor of it.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the committee will note that all of the conferees on our side have signed this conference

report and we are supporting it as was agreed to by the conference committee.

However, during the subsequent discussion of this bill, I am going to request that the ranking minority members on our side handle the different items as they come up for consideration.

I should like to join, however, with my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] in one observation which the gentleman has made on the question of inflation.

We must be careful in spending. With respect to inflation it is not only the appropriated dollars that tend to fan the flame of inflation, but whatever dollars are used, whether from trust funds or appropriated funds. And I would hope—and I join my friend from Texas in the hope—that we will be very careful in the use of trust funds, appropriated dollars, or whatever they may be, in order to keep expenditures at the lowest possible level so we can continue to fight inflation.

I am sure that is the intention of the gentleman from Texas, and it is certainly my intention.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the conferees on the pending supplemental appropriation bill saw fit to include \$140,000 for the construction of an airport at Kelley Flats, Mont.

It will be remembered that on October 17, Members of the House refused, on a rollcall vote, to approve this expenditure and for the reason that it had not

previously been considered by the House Appropriations Committee and therefore was special-privilege legislation.

Moreover, many Members, including myself, insisted that there ought to be State participation in the construction of this airport rather than 100-percent financed by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the fever for adjournment of this session of Congress is running high and I recognize the facts of life, one of these facts being that to attempt to now strike this item from the bill might well prolong the session.

Let the RECORD show my feeling that it is most unfortunate that certain Members of Congress have again made this demand at this late hour and that certain other Members have acquiesced in the demand.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, much fuss is being raised in this session of Congress by Republicans and southern Democrats over a so-called financial crisis which they are using to justify cut-backs in domestic programs. Factually, however, one has every right to question whether the budget cutters are being fiscally responsible or merely using economy to destroy antipoverty measures, aid to education, medicare, social security, and civil rights.

This conservative coalition, under the guise of economy, has fought rent supplements for needy families, inserted a States rights provision into the aid-to-education bill, emasculated the model cities program, weakened the Teacher Corps to help train deprived children, and voted to slash \$460 million from the antipoverty program.

Such cuts are not fiscal responsibility for there is no saving in depriving our neediest citizens of education, employment, health protection, and better housing only to end up paying much more in welfare, crime, slums, urban decay, and social disorders. The old saying "a stitch in time saves nine" is still a good one.

Perhaps we should examine more closely this fantasy of budget cutting for the delusion it actually is and not be romanced into accepting such cuts as saving us from increased taxation or required by our current financial situation.

Charges of runaway expenditures, mounting debt burdens, and ever-increasing Federal taxes are just not true.

It is true that over 32 million individuals still live in poverty but most Americans are enjoying more prosperity than ever before. Their personal income after taxes—and adjusted to 1958 dollars—has risen over 20 percent since 1961.

In the last 5 years civilian employment has gained over 7 million persons while unemployment has decreased in sharp contrast to the Eisenhower administration in which it rose from 2.9 percent to 5.5 percent.

Excluding Vietnam, expenditures—exclusive of interest on debt, veterans' benefits, and civilian pay increases—have risen by less than 3 percent per year during the last 5 years despite a population increase of over 9½ million people.

Federal tax rates are actually lower today than in 1963, in sharp contrast to rising State and local taxes. And despite unprecedented prosperity we have

maintained price stability. At the same time the national debt as a percent of the gross national product, has decreased—from 57.1 percent in 1961 to 42.8 percent in 1967.

Ours today is the richest and most powerful country in the world. And we have various ways of meeting our fiscal problem. We can increase our annual economic growth and we can, as a last resort, raise taxes. But if we must raise taxes at least we ought to obtain the increases from those who are more prosperous than ever before. Above all we should not cut funds for the poor, the sick, the aged, and the disabled who need help more than ever. This is not only sound economics but simple morality as well.

No one, of course, can rightfully oppose budget reductions wherever justified. But the issue before us is one of priorities. On what can we spend less? And where should we not cut?

The current issue of Time magazine gives good advice on this issue. It opposes pennywise reductions in Federal educational aid, the Peace Corps, and the war on poverty.

At the same time, Time magazine wisely points out "the richest field for cutting is down on the farm" where farm subsidies, often to the wealthiest farmers, now amount to \$3.3 billion and rising farm food prices constitute a strong force for inflation.

Also, a reduction in our \$74.5 billion defense budget is recommended, especially in military construction, which too often is more political than essential.

And finally, the budget cutters can well take a second look at public works, where projects are often located in the districts of those who vote to cut antipoverty funds while grabbing bigger chunks of the tax dollar for their own pet projects.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, as you and all of our colleagues in the House know, the entire Montana congressional delegation has been working hard this week urging that the Corps of Engineers be authorized to join with the Federal Aviation Administration and interests in the Libby Dam area in the construction of a permanent airport at Kelley Flats in my district.

I appeal to you to vote in favor of the amendment which has been attached to the supplemental appropriations bill. The support which I have received from my colleagues is greatly appreciated and I want to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude for the support our appeal has received in the House of Representatives.

A favorable vote today would reverse an earlier decision made in this body. The question is whether the Corps of Engineers should be forced to use approximately \$140,000 in funds already appropriated to construct a temporary landing strip on a site which would later be flooded by dam water or to allow the Corps to combine its appropriation with other funds available to construct a permanent airport which would continue to serve the rapidly expanding Libby area after the dam's completion.

The earlier decision to refuse author-

ization did not mean a saving of money. It was not economical. It was a vote to allow a project which, in the long run, will be extremely wasteful.

But, today we have a chance to vote for the aid of a small town and a big dam. The city of Libby needs this chance to be linked to the abounding airways of our great Nation permanently—not temporarily. And the Corps of Engineers and various contractors will benefit, too, because their work will be more efficient—larger airplanes will be able to land on the improved airport and I have been assured that the safety factor will be greatly enhanced.

On behalf of all concerned, and particularly my distinguished colleagues in the Senate from Montana, Senators MIKE MANSFIELD and LEE METCALF, may I once again urge you to vote favorably for Kelley Flats.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RHODES of Arizona moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 14397 to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 108, nays 254, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 445]

YEAS—108

Abernethy	Collier	Gubser
Adair	Cramer	Hagan
Andrews, Ala.	Curtis	Haley
Ashmore	Davis, Wis.	Hall
Bennett	Derwinski	Hansen, Idaho
Berry	Dole	Henderson
Betts	Dowdy	Hull
Bevill	Downing	Hunt
Blackburn	Edwards, Ala.	Hutchinson
Brinkley	Eshleman	Ichord
Brown, Ohio	Findley	Jarman
Broyhill, N.C.	Fino	Johnson, Pa.
Broyhill, Va.	Fisher	Jonas
Buchanan	Flynt	Jones, N.C.
Burke, Fla.	Fountain	Kleppe
Burleson	Fulton, Tenn.	Kornegay
Cederberg	Gathings	Latta
Chamberlain	Gettys	Lennon
Clancy	Goodling	Lipscomb
Clawson, Del	Gross	Long, La.
Cleveland	Grover	McClure

McEwen
McMillan
Marsh
Montgomery
Myers
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Pettis
Poff
Pool
Price, Tex.
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.

Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Scott
Selden
Smith, Calif.
Snyder

Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stuckey
Taylor
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Waggonner
Whalley
Whitener
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Winn
Wylie
Zion

NAYS—254

Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Clark
Clausen,
Don H.
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dulski
Duncan
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Foley
Ford,
William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Galifianakis
Gallagher

Garmatz
Glaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gude
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Hollifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Irwin
Jacobs
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Leggett
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McCloskey
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
Macdonald,
Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.

Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Pryor
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rallsback
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Riegle
Robison
Rodino
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Scheuer
Schweiker
Schwengel
Shriver
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Whalen
White
Whitten
Widnall
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyder
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NOT VOTING—71

Abbutt
Adams
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Bates
Boiling
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Celler
Colmer
Corbett
Dawson
Devine
Dickinson
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, La.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Ford, Gerald R.
Fuqua
Gardner
Gray

Griffiths
Gurney
Halleck
Hanna
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Herlong
Hicks
Hosmer
Hungate
Jones, Mo.
King, N.Y.
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Lukens
McFall
Mailliard
Martin
Nichols
Pucinski
Reinecke

Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Rostenkowski
St. Onge
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Stratton
Sullivan
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Tuck
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Everett for, with Mr. Annunzio against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Gerald R. Ford against.

Mr. Martin for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Abbutt for, with Mr. Rostenkowski against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mrs. Sullivan against.
Mr. Fuqua for, with Mr. Adams against.

Mr. Hungate for, with Mr. Hicks against.
Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Resnick against.

Mr. Tuck for, with Mr. Rogers of Colorado against.

Mr. Kuykendall for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Mr. Watson for, with Mr. King of New York against.

Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Kupferman against.

Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Gurney for, with Mr. Bates against.
Mr. Ashbrook for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Edmondson with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Teague of California.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Sisk with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wyatt.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Reinecke.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Brock changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. GROVER and LIPSCOMB changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 3: Page 3, line 10, strike out "\$1,612,500,000" and insert "\$1,980,000,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$1,773,000,000: *Provided*, That those provisions of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 that set mandatory funding levels for programs newly authorized therein shall not be effective during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 4, line 12, insert the following:

"SENATE"

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, since amendments numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 14 all deal with matters pertaining only to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the other amendments en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 4, line 14, insert the following:

"ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS"

"Effective January 1, 1968, the clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the State of Indiana shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of five million, the population of said State having exceeded five million inhabitants; and that the clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the State of New Jersey shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of seven million, the population of said State having exceeded seven million inhabitants."

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 5, line 1, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY"

"Effective January 1, 1968, the Secretary may fix the compensation of the assistant reporter of debates at not to exceed \$17,860 gross per annum."

Senate Amendment No. 7: Page 5, line 5, insert the following:

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE"

Senate Amendment No. 8: Page 5, line 6, insert the following:

"FOLDING DOCUMENTS"

"For an additional amount for 'Folding Documents', \$8,000."

Senate Amendment No. 9: Page 5, line 9, insert the following:

"POSTAGE STAMPS"

"For an additional amount for airmail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, \$9,040: *Provided*, That the President of the Senate and each Senator from a State east of the Mississippi River shall be allowed an additional \$80, and each Senator from a State west of the Mississippi River shall be allowed an additional \$100."

Senate Amendment No. 10: Page 6, line 2, insert the following:

"CAPITOL BUILDINGS"

Senate Amendment No. 11: Page 6, line 7, insert the following:

"SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS"

"For an additional amount for 'Senate Office Buildings', \$231,000, to remain available until expended."

Senate Amendment No. 14: Page 6, line 16, insert the following:

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION"

"The second paragraph under the heading 'Senate Office Buildings' in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966 (79 Stat. 1147), is amended by striking out '\$7,700' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$8,200'."

Mr. MAHON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the aforementioned Senate amendments be dispensed with and that they considered en bloc and printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 14, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 7, line 22, insert:

"Sec. 602. Funds heretofore appropriated to the Department of the Army for the Libby Dam and Reservoir project in Montana may be used in an amount not to exceed \$140,000 in participation with local interests and the Federal Aviation Administration for the construction of an airport facility at Kelley Flats, Montana, in a manner deemed appropriate by the Chief of Engineers."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Change the section number in said amendment from "Sec. 602" to "Sec. 502."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the conference report may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10397. An act, for the relief of Nguyen Van Be (James Be Roellig).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 13042. An act to amend the act of June 20, 1906, and the District of Columbia election law to provide for the election of members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1566. An act to amend sections 3 and 4 of the act approved September 22, 1964 (78 Stat. 990), providing for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12080) entitled "An Act to amend the Social Security Act to provide an increase in benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide benefits for additional categories of individuals, to improve the public assistance program and programs relating to the welfare and health of children, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1941. An act to prevent, abate, and control air pollution in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States.

FIXING THE TIME OF ASSEMBLY OF THE SECOND SESSION, 90TH CONGRESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 960) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. Res. 960

Joint resolution establishing that the second regular session of the Ninetieth Congress convene at noon on Monday, January 15, 1968

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second regular session of the Ninetieth Congress shall begin at noon on Monday, January 15, 1968.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7819) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster; and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1049)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7819) to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary education by extending authority for allocation of funds to be used for education of Indian children and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense, by extending and amending the National Teacher Corps program, by providing assistance for comprehensive educational planning, and by improving programs of education for the handicapped; to improve authority for assistance to schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That this Act may be cited as the "Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967".

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 2. Rules, regulations, guidelines, or other published interpretations or orders issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the United States Office of Education, or by any official of such agencies, in connection with, or affecting, the administration of programs authorized by

Security Act Amendments has been filed and a vote on it is imminent.

I am directing this memo to the 121 Democrats and Republicans who voted or were recorded against the conference report as well.

The bill that emerges from conference, in my judgement, represents no appreciable improvement over what we considered in the House. This legislation is still unwise, unnecessary, and unconstitutional.

Indeed, the presumption that the SACB rests on constitutional quicksand is further strengthened by the Supreme Court decision only this Monday in *U.S. v. Robel*. This 6-2 case invalidated the prohibition in the Internal Security Act against any member of a "Communist-action organization" from working in a defense facility when it falls under a final order to register.

There is no attempt to reconcile the legislation with the *Robel* case. When so integral a section as this one is struck, what remains is only a brittle patchwork.

Essentially, the conference report stitches together both the House and Senate bills. The only pivotal addition, however, is a modification of the so-called *Proxmire amendment* on which the Senate leadership insisted.

This amendment originally provided that SACB would lapse on June 30, 1969 unless proceedings had been instituted and hearings conducted by the Board by December 31, 1968. The Attorney General would make a determination whether these specifications had been met, and if not, the Board would dissolve automatically on the date specified.

This probationary provision has been emasculated in conference. Now it sets but one proceeding and one hearing as the mandatory minimum. The hearing qualification is already met by the pending DuBois case, and the mere institution of one proceeding in the next twelve months would hardly justify the expense of paying five men \$26,000 each for that minimal activity.

Furthermore, the steps by which the Board might finally be dissolved are not clear.

However, the case against S.2171 (previously H.R. 12601) does remain clear:

No law enforcement agency of the government has requested this bill. All who have previously testified on this legislation were convinced that we have strong laws on the books to deal with treason, sabotage, espionage, and actions looking to the overthrow of the government.

Neither in the past 17 years nor in the future will it offer any added protection against the real dangers of Communism but on the contrary will damage our fundamental freedoms.

It is enfeebled by adjudicated constitutional infirmities and racked by prospective ones.

SACB is an empty vessel not worth maintaining either for what it costs or for what it accomplishes.

I urge you to vote against this conference report.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. CULVER.

(I am attaching an editorial on this subject from the New York Times of this morning.)

[From the New York Times, Dec. 13, 1967]

ON THE COMMUNIST FRONT

One bill that deserves to be forgotten in the Congressional rush for adjournment—but probably won't be—is the bill to reanimate the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The board has spent \$5 million of the taxpayers' money in seventeen years without succeeding in registering a single Communist. It has had virtually nothing to do since 1965, when the Supreme Court ruled that forcing Communists to register with the

board was a violation of constitutional guarantees against self-incrimination.

The Supreme Court's refusal this week to bar the board from holding hearings in another area of its concern—exposure of "Communist-front" groups—does permit the five board members to go ahead with hearings on whether the campus-based DuBois Clubs are a "front." But to do so would be an exercise in futility. Assuming the DuBois organization is found to be a "front," a requirement that it register as such would seem to be as questionable constitutionally as rulings invalidated by the previous court decisions.

Besides, under the new anti-subversion bill passed by both the Senate and the House and now in conference, there would be no need for any individual or group to register as Communist, Communist-front or Communist-infiltrated, or even to appear at a hearing. The board could make those findings on its own, and an organization so branded would have to carry that brand on all its literature.

The bill seeks to get around the self-incrimination difficulty, but in so doing it poses a threat to freedom Liberals and conservatives who fought the measure in both houses called vainly on the President to make his position clear. He still can—by vetoing the bill when it reaches his desk.

The Supreme Court's other civil-liberties ruling this week—voiding a provision that made it a crime for a Communist to work in a defense plant—restores a saner approach to the problem of keeping security risks from sensitive positions in defense industry. The way to do that is through specific laws and regulations, of which there are plenty, not through blanket proscriptions that do more to penalize the innocent than catch the subversive. Freedom cannot be defended by being undermined.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14397) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 14 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3 and 19 to the bill and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1968—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14397) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of December 14, 1968, p. H17004, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum, because I have been asked to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in the conference report and the accompanying motions on the supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 14397) the following results were obtained.

For the Office of Economic Opportunity, \$1,773,000,000, which is the figure that we agreed on, in lieu of the figure of \$1,980,000,000 in the Senate version of the bill and the figure of \$1,612,500,000 in the House version of the bill.

For the Appalachian regional development programs, \$56,700,000, as contrasted with \$64,200,000 in the Senate and \$54,000,000 in the House.

In doing this we took into account the extension of the continuing resolution that we passed, which would have compelled a reduction in spending of 10 percent in programs and 2 percent in the personnel funds.

The Senate provision for \$2,800,000 for the James Madison Memorial Building for the Library of Congress was not approved and was removed without prejudice to the merits.

I think I should say, with reference to this item, that it was presented to the House. The House rejected it. An appeal was taken to the Senate. We inserted it.

I think we were wise to insert it, for the reason that we are now paying \$880,000 a year to store books for the Library of Congress.

We need this building sorely. It is not only a memorial to Madison, but it also has a very practical and utilitarian purpose of housing books. But the House conferees felt that, in view of the fiscal situation, it could wait until we came back next year.

The Senate amendment which would have provided \$17,247,269 for various Indian claims was struck at this time with the statement in the report:

It is fully expected that these items will be considered and acted upon early in the next session . . . in the first Supplemental Bill.

Here again, I must say that we were wise in putting this item in the Senate, because these are adjudicated claims, the money will have to be paid, it is going to be paid to poor Indians, and we felt there was a relevancy between poor Indians and other poor people in the United States of America.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say, Mr. President, as the author of the amendment that was added in the Senate bill, that I should like to express my appreciation, first to the chairman of our conference, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. He fought valiantly, persuasively, and effectively in the conference committee for this award. He certainly did so with completely unselfish motivation, because I am sure Rhode Island does not have very many Indian reservations any more.

Mr. PASTORE. We do not have any at all.

Mr. MUNDT. It does not have any Indians, I suppose.

Mr. PASTORE. No, we have a few Indians, but no reservations. We have assimilated them.

Mr. MUNDT. But I wish to say, for the information of Senators from the areas where the Indians are, that the Senator from Rhode Island did a magnificent job, and fought courageously and effectively for this amendment.

I am disappointed that this \$17 million, which has been awarded to the Indians by official adjudication of the Government, has been denied them. This is the only place that I can recall in this entire session of Congress where we have continued to practice abject discrimination against the member of a different race, the red man. He is entitled to the funds; these claims have been accumulating for a century in some instances, and this simply means he will be deprived of the money which is his until such time as the supplemental bill makes it available.

I should like to engage my friend from Rhode Island in a bit of colloquy at this point, to reinforce the language of the House conferees, because, under the arrangement which we follow, the Senate conferees do not write a report; it is written on behalf of the managers of the House. It does express, however, the consensus of the conferees of both Houses, and it was made specifically clear, as I am sure the Senator from Rhode Island will agree with me, that in the first supplemental appropriation bill next year this item will be included; and we have assurances from the conferees on both sides that they will support it. Is that not the understanding?

Mr. PASTORE. That is absolutely correct; and I wish to say this: God willing, when we come back, the Senator from Rhode Island will be the chairman of the subcommittee that deals with supplementals, and my distinguished friend, the Senator from South Dakota, will be the ranking Republican, and we will get the job done and there will be no question at all that the item will get in.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. In a moment. Again, I want to say I am proud of the fact that Senator PASTORE fought as hard for this item as he did for other items in the bill, where we were also forced to make concessions; and I certainly agree with this observation that we were pennywise and pound foolish, in my opinion, to continue to spend \$800,000 a year for the rental of space for the Library of Congress, which has insufficient space for its

books, in order to effect an "economy" of saving some \$2 million which we had appropriated in this bill to get the new library building started.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wish to associate myself with the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], who is also on the committee.

I think we concluded the discussion of this issue by the Senator from Washington suggesting to the House conferees, "Well, can we say to the Indians, who have had this claim legally adjudicated, that they can look forward within 60 days to getting their money?"

The House conferees all nodded their heads, as I recall.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If they do not do that, we will jerk their heads up again.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I was very regretful that we were not able to sustain this appropriation for the Indians in conference with the House of Representatives. The Indians have been nearly 100 years getting this claim adjudicated, and even if we had appropriated the money, they actually would not receive their payments for a year or two, at least; it requires further legislation to distribute the money to the Indians in my State and elsewhere and I believe in every other State. They are the poorest people of all, who need help the worst.

But I think the record we have made will assure that the appropriation will be made early next year.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, when this supplemental bill passed the Senate, I was one of, I believe, seven Senators who voted against it.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that about 2 years ago I resolved to stop voting for most supplemental appropriation bills, particularly those that we pass in the last hours of a closing session of Congress. I did this because, in the years I have served on the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate, I have seen us, year after year, struggle and fight, and squeeze the appropriations, and then, time after time, it all goes right back in in a supplemental bill.

I do wish to say, however, that I congratulate and commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. I think that on the years I have served on Appropriations Committees of Congress, I do not recall a chairman of a supplemental appropriation who has tried any harder to avoid the very thing I have just commented upon.

I did vote against the bill when it passed the Senate the other day, partly because of the general principles of the resolution I had formed, and partly because I thought this particular bill went too far in certain respects.

I think the results of the conference have been, on the whole, very satisfac-

tory. I think, in justice to the Senator from Rhode Island, that there is not anyone who can say that this supplemental has not been screened with the very greatest of care; and I intend to vote for it should there be a rollcall.

Again I commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island and his associates.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join my fellow Senators in commending the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who is really a wizard in conference, and who can accomplish more than any other Senator that I know of when he gets down to business.

May I say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that I, to, am very sorry that his efforts to get some very badly needed appropriation moneys for the Indian claims was not allowed; but by the same token, I am delighted that there is firm language in the report which holds out more than a strong hope that early next year this matter will be attended to.

While I am on my feet, I say to the distinguished chairman and all the members of the committee, on behalf of the people of Montana, that I am indeed grateful that it was possible, because of their efforts and the acquiescence of the House conferees, to retain the legislative reallocation for the Kelley Flats Airport in Montana.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. I have only one observation, Mr. President: Encomiums of this high quality are usually paid only to a Senator who is about to leave the Senate. I have no such intention.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the conference report, under Office of Economic Opportunity, there appears this language: "\$1,773,000,000: *Provided*, That those provisions of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 that set mandatory funding levels for programs newly authorized therein, shall not be effective until the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968."

I have two questions. I take it it will be effective for the fiscal year 1969. Second, will the Senator give us an example of how that would work?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will hold that question in abeyance until we get through with this matter, I will get into that in some depth. We will bring up the matter at that time.

Mr. MILLER. I will be happy to wait.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from New York want to discuss that very proposition. I will answer those questions at that time, with the kind indulgence of the Senator.

So, in conclusion, the total of the bill would be \$1,842,923,790, which is \$234,586,519 under the Senate version of \$2,077,510,309; \$163,487,290 over the House version, which totaled \$1,679,436,500; and \$277,861,210 under the budget estimates, which totaled \$2,120,785,000.

Mr. President, we are ready for the vote.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is the Senator from Rhode Island now prepared to discuss the provisions with respect to the Economic Opportunity Act appropriations?

Mr. PASTORE. I am.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to make a statement and see if my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, is in accord with what I say.

The House has added to the appropriations bill, as it passed the Senate, the following amendment: "\$1,773,000,000, *Provided*, That those provisions of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 that set mandatory funding levels for programs newly authorized therein shall not be effective during fiscal year 1968."

In explaining this proposed amendment, Representative MAHON, the chairman of the House conferees said on the floor of the House:

The authorization bill for the Office of Economic Opportunity included a few new programs. In at least two instances, a floor was placed in the legislation with regard to the amount of funds that were to be used for these programs. For instance, with regard to the new Special Impact Programs.

I pause to point out that the special impact program is not new. It was in effect last year, has been authorized and is presently an ongoing program; \$25 million was appropriated for it. It is presently in effect. I go back to the quotation:

The authorization bill carries the following language: "Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve not less than 7 percent for the purpose of carrying out this part." Also, in connection with the newly authorized Emergency Food and Medical Services.

I interpolate that this is a new authorization for this program. There never was specific reference to it before, although the OEO has always had general authority to fund such assistance.

I continue the quote:

The bill carries the following language: "The Director shall reserve and make available not less than \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and not less than \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for the purpose of carrying out this program."

Since practically one-half of the fiscal year is passed and since it is highly unlikely that these new programs can be immediately inaugurated since rules and regulations and guidelines must be established, the conferees felt it unwise to require that not less than a certain sum be spent on such programs. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion in connection with Amendment No. 3 which will include language to set aside these floors on all new programs for fiscal year 1968.

The motion was the one I read a moment ago.

I continue to quote:

This action is not taken with a view to discouraging the prompt initiation of the programs but simply to give the Director some discretion in the matter of funding. The language in the motion which will be offered is effective only for the remainder of this fiscal year. It does not extend to fiscal year 1969.

I ask my friend, the Senator from Rhode Island, whether the net effect of

that is not solely to remove from the special impact program, whether or not it is new, the mandatory 7-percent floor and to remove from the emergency food program, which is new, the mandatory \$25 million floor, and leave the expenditure of the whole \$1,773 million and, within that total, the funds allocated to the two programs, substantially within the discretion of Mr. Shriver, the director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is absolutely correct. I think we ought to place in the RECORD the whole historical background that led to this.

This was not unilateral initiative on the part of the House. This was also a suggestion on the part of the conferees of the Senate.

Here is the full picture, and I hope we will all harken to the figures I give.

The Senate legislative committee authorized \$2,258 million for this fiscal year. That was the authorization.

The administration submitted a budget estimate of \$2,060 million. When the measure went to conference between the House and Senate, they agreed on a figure of \$1,980 million.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I hope the Senator will not bring this up now, but will wait until we get through. I will then come back.

Mr. CLARK. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we reported from the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee the amount that was agreed to in conference, the authorized amount of \$1,980 million.

When Mr. Shriver appeared before our committee, he explained that in order for him to carry out all of the programs that are now in progress at the current level would require \$1,788 million.

When we went to the conference, the best figure we could get was \$1,773 million, which is \$15 million below the amount that Sargent Shriver said he would need in order to carry out the programs he is now conducting at the current level. That means that if he is to pursue that course, to begin with, he will be short \$15 million.

If we set a floor on any particular program—and the requirement in the authorization bill on this was 7 percent set aside of the amount appropriated for title I—and if we take 7 percent of the amount agreed upon in conference, that comes to \$49 million.

If we take \$49 million in that program and then take the Stennis program of \$25 million, that brings us to a total of \$74 million.

If we take \$74 million out of \$1,773 million, and allocate it to one program, it necessarily means that Sargent Shriver would have to begin either to cut down, suffocate, or cut out one of the ongoing programs.

In order not to put him in that box—and I use that word advisedly—we thought that the best way to handle it, if all the money he was going to have was \$1,773 million, was to give him the flexibility and the discretion to run this program, and, if at any time, he felt he could put a little more money in one program than in another program, or reallo-

cate the money, he ought to be given that discretion. And that was done.

Because of that fact, we removed the restriction, and that was the only reason for it—not because we did not want to pursue the impact program, not because we did not want him to feed the hungry children. We want him to do all that. But we wanted to give him the latitude to use \$1.773 billion the best way he knew in carrying out the purpose of Congress. That is the only reason we did it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with everything the Senator has said, and I believe what he did was sensible and wise.

I should like to make just two additional comments.

First. The Senator—quite inadvertently, I am sure—referred to the amount requested by the administration as \$2,060 million, which is correct; but the amount authorized by the House was only \$1,600 million.

Mr. PASTORE. Appropriated, rather.

Mr. CLARK. Authorized.

Mr. PASTORE. Authorized, too?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

So that when we went to conference on the authorization bill, we had a pretty tough time getting them up to \$1,980,000,000.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. And I congratulate the Senator from Rhode Island again for sticking with the authorization committee in bringing out of the Senate the full amount authorized.

My final point is that, although the special impact program is no longer mandatorily earmarked because, with all due deference to the Appropriations Committee, they undertook to tinker with the legislative authorization bill—

Mr. PASTORE. We had to, under the circumstances.

Mr. CLARK. I am not quarreling with the Senator.

Mr. PASTORE. It is not a matter of tinkering. It is a matter of doing what is right.

Mr. CLARK. Now, let us make this clear. Certainly, so far as the authorization committee is concerned—and I speak as the chairman of the conference committee on the authorization—I hope very much that despite the amendment which has been introduced in the appropriation bill, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Bureau of the Budget will look with great favor upon feeding the hungry children and adults of America and using some part of this bill for the Stennis program, the emergency food and medical services.

I hope, also, that since the special impact program is not a new program—it is already in effect—some part of the money with respect to which he has acquired new flexibility, by reason of the action of the Appropriations Committee, will be spent to keep the special impact program going at least at the rate at which funds were appropriated for it last year, and I hope more.

I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if Sargent Shriver does not feed the hungry

children with this money, then I do not know the man; because I know of no greater man or greater humanitarian who came over the pike in my public life than Sargent Shriver. I have complete confidence in him. I think he is a great administrator, a great American, and a great humanitarian.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to join the majority leader and other Senators in a tribute to the creativity, the skill, the integrity, and the fair attitude of the Senator from Rhode Island, whom I have the pleasure of working with in the Appropriations Committee. I speak as a conferee on the authorization bill, as the ranking minority member of the legislative committee, and now as a member of the Appropriations Committee—and I believe I have been through as many of these negotiations as anyone else.

What the Senator has done now is to make crystal clear, in my judgment, what the situation amounts to. I shall not repeat what has been done.

The Senator will recall that one of the most creative actions taken by the Appropriations Committee was the statement in the report which resulted from the suggestion of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], which reads as follows:

The Office of Economic Opportunity is directed to examine, reexamine, and keep its programs under constant evaluation, with a view toward weeding out programs that are insufficient and replacing them with either proven or new programs which are more promising. The committee strongly feels that much greater concentration should be directed toward the worst areas of poverty. The committee is to be kept informed.

Is there anything that has been done by the conference, that has been said in that conference, in the other body, or said here, which, in the judgment of the manager of the conference report, changes the direction that is there stated?

Mr. PASTORE. No. As a matter of fact, it should be made clear that we expect Sargent Shriver to have the flexibility to move around. He is admonished in this report to watch these programs very closely, to see whether, in his judgment, they are carrying out the purpose, whether they are too expensive, or for any other reason, and to do what needs to be done. This is the admonishment and I believe it is acceptable to him, and I believe he will do it.

Mr. JAVITS. When we speak of authorized programs in the committee report, we include even programs in which we have eliminated the concept of floor? That all programs, including previously authorized or old programs—such as community action, special impact, and small business assistance—as well as newly authorized programs—such as emergency food and day care—all stand on the same footing in terms of their eligibility for funding?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. So that the Senator would agree that we have eliminated floors, but we have set no ceilings?

Mr. PASTORE. We have not vitiated these programs. We have not touched

these programs. All we have done is to remove the compulsory floor. That, I am afraid, would have tied up the administrator a little too unduly.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator will recall that when we discussed this matter at the time the supplemental appropriation bill was before us. I made reference to the fact that in the report of the other body, in the report of the House Appropriations Committee, they sought to earmark more than \$1 million of the supplemental appropriation for special purposes. The Senator then said:

Therefore, we, in our report, vitiated that. We will go into a conference and talk about it and I do not think we will have much trouble.

I ask the Senator this question: As the result of the conference, the Senator states to the Senate that the earmarking attempted in the House Appropriations Committee report was vitiated?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Now, last, is the Senator's view confirmed, in his judgment—I believe it is, but I ask his judgment—by the statement of Chairman Mahon of the House Appropriations Committee, on the House floor—the statement which Senator Clark read—when he stated:

This action—

To wit, the adoption of this particular amendment to the legislation which was adopted in the House—

is not taken with a view to discouraging the prompt initiation of the programs—

Including the new programs—

but simply to give the Director some discretion in the matter of funding.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. If there is any question about it, it certainly will not be because we did not have it very clear.

Mr. PASTORE. To return to the question asked by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], this only applies to 1968. It does not apply to 1969. So far as 1969 is concerned, what was authorized and contained in the authorization bill is binding.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator. I especially appreciate the full explanation by both the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I say that the statement which I attributed to Mrs. SMITH, which was initiated by her, is the result of the joint work of Mrs. SMITH and Senator MILTON YOUNG, the ranking minority member of our committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from

Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 3, as follows:

[No. 394 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Baker	Church	Griffin
Bennett	Clark	Hansen
Bible	Cooper	Harris
Boggs	Cotton	Hart
Brewster	Curtis	Hatfield
Brooke	Dirksen	Hayden
Burdick	Dominick	Hickenlooper
Byrd, Va.	Ervin	Holland
Byrd, W. Va.	Fannin	Hollings
Cannon	Fong	Hruska
Carlson	Fulbright	Jackson
Case	Gore	Javits

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued				
Department or activity	Version of bill		Budget estimate	Conference action
	House	Senate		
CHAPTER III				
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY				
Economic opportunity program.....	\$1,612,500,000	\$1,980,000,000	\$2,060,000,000	\$1,773,000,000
CHAPTER IV				
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH				
Senate				
Contingent expenses of the Senate:				
Folding documents.....		8,000		8,000
Postage.....		9,040		9,040
House of Representatives				
Gratuity to widow of deceased member.....	30,000	30,000		30,000
Architect of the Capitol				
Capitol buildings and grounds:				
Extension of the Capitol (by transfer).....	2 (135,000)	2 (135,000)		2 (135,000)
Senate Office Buildings.....		231,000		231,000
Library buildings and grounds, Library of Congress:				
James Madison Memorial Building.....		2,800,000		
Total chapter IV.....	30,000	3,078,040		278,040
CHAPTER V				
Claims and judgments.....		17,247,269		
Grand total.....	1,679,436,500	2,077,510,309	2,120,785,000	1,842,923,790

¹ Excludes \$4,200,000 requested but previously carried as a budget estimate in other appropriation bills.
² To be derived by transfer from "Expansion of facilities, Capitol Power Plant."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, if I may have just one moment, I know we are coming to the end of our day, which will probably be the last day of this session, but I want to take this occasion to thank all members of the Appropriations Committee for their fine cooperation in working out these last two bills under very trying circumstances, but particularly to say a word of praise to the members of the staff, to all the dedicated young men and women who devoted themselves so arduously to their responsibilities, which made things easier than they otherwise would have been.

I say to my colleagues now in the Chamber, as this may be the last day I am on my feet to speak here during this session, I want to wish you all a Merry Christmas.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I say, as one who labored in the vineyard a little bit with our distinguished chairman in trying, first, to bring out a foreign aid bill and, second, in conferences with the other body in trying to bring the final figures together, that we have at last produced a final figure which has been adopted and now goes to the President for his signature. Also in the hearings, and the testimony for the building of supplemental appropriations and the handling of them both on the floor and in conference, and now in the conference report, I want to say that I do not believe I have ever seen such a diligent, such a patient, such an aggressive—it is hard to be both patient and aggressive at the same time, but we have seen that here—such an altogether effective performance by any one Senator as I have seen displayed on the part of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

I want to say that he should have a happy Christmas. He should go away from here with a conscience at perfect rest because he has done the finest job any person could do in handling these two difficult bills which came in here at

ate numbered 3 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:
In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$1,773,000,000: *Provided*, That those provisions of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 that set mandatory funding levels for programs newly authorized therein shall not be effective during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:
Change the section number in said amendment from "Sec. 602" to read: "Sec. 502".

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3 and 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a tabulation of the bill reflecting the budget estimates submitting the amount agreed to in the House and the amounts agreed to in the Senate on the final conference figure.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was adopted be reconsidered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments in disagreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:
Change the section number in said amendment from "Sec. 602" to read: "Sec. 502".

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3 and 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a tabulation of the bill reflecting the budget estimates submitting the amount agreed to in the House and the amounts agreed to in the Senate on the final conference figure.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL				
Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		Conference action
		House	Senate	
CHAPTER I				
INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
Appalachian Regional Commission				
Salaries and expenses.....	\$785,000	\$706,500	\$785,000	\$745,750
Appalachian regional development programs.....	160,000,000	54,000,000	64,200,000	56,700,000
Total chapter I.....	60,785,000	54,706,500	64,985,000	57,445,750
CHAPTER II				
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
Office of Saline Water				
Salaries and expenses.....	(13,482,000)	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION				
Salaries and expenses.....	-----	2,200,000	2,200,000	2,200,000
Total chapter II.....	-----	12,200,000	12,200,000	12,200,000

"11:59" just before we go home at "midnight."

From the bottom of my heart, I want to congratulate him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is difficult to express my feelings at this time to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. Rarely have I ever had the opportunity to witness any Senator managing two highly important conference reports with such outstanding skill and ability within such a short period of time. On the surface, the record cannot possibly demonstrate the long hours and tireless devotion involved in reaching an agreement at the conference concerning a matter of such magnitude as the supplemental appropriations measure containing the poverty program

funds. But when that task is made doubly difficult with the addition of the foreign aid appropriations measure, it is a truly outstanding event. Senator PASTORE has earned the deepest gratitude of the entire Senate.

TABULATION OF ALL APPROPRIATION BILLS HANDLED DURING THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 90TH CONGRESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of all appropriation bills handled during the first session of the 90th Congress. Among other things, this table shows direct appropria-

tions totaling \$127,477,895,247 made during this session. This amount is \$5,795,188,030 below the budget estimates submitted to the Senate.

In addition to the appropriation measures, the Congress has approved House Joint Resolution 888 which contains provisions to reduce Federal obligations in fiscal year 1968 in excess of \$9 billion and Federal expenditures in fiscal year 1968 in excess of \$4 billion under the budget estimates submitted by the President. The latter figures include specific reductions made by the Congress in the appropriation bills.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF ACTION ON APPROPRIATION BILLS, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS.

[Does not include any permanent appropriations ¹]

	Budget estimates considered by House	Passed House	Budget estimates considered by Senate	Passed Senate	Enacted	(+) or (-), enacted compared to budget
Bills for fiscal 1968:						
Treasury-Post Office.....	\$7,613,787,000	\$7,499,230,000	\$7,615,148,000	\$7,555,167,000	\$7,545,641,000	-\$69,507,000
District of Columbia:						
Federal payments.....	63,499,000	59,499,000	73,499,000	71,499,000	67,478,200	-6,020,800
Federal loan appropriation.....	49,600,000	48,100,000	89,700,000	79,200,000	79,200,000	-10,500,000
Interior.....	1,443,793,000	1,365,310,150	1,458,218,000	1,399,359,550	1,382,848,350	-75,369,650
Loan and contract authorizations.....	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(16,200,000)	(-14,500,000)
Independent Offices-HUD.....	² 10,804,642,700	² 10,013,178,782	² 10,820,523,700	² 10,514,830,900	² 10,139,473,900	-681,039,800
Contract authorization (rent supplements).....	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(-30,000,000)
Labor-HEW.....	³ 13,322,603,000	³ 13,137,488,000	³ 13,424,146,000	13,421,660,000	³ 13,255,356,000	-168,790,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary.....	² 2,342,942,000	² 2,194,026,500	² 2,347,803,195	² 2,186,105,500	² 2,169,012,500	-178,790,695
Legislative.....	231,311,132	228,089,952	276,005,210	275,885,804	275,699,035	-306,175
Agriculture.....	⁴ 5,021,097,400	⁴ 4,770,580,950	⁴ 5,021,097,400	⁴ 4,782,529,789	⁴ 4,952,945,700	-68,151,700
Loan authorization.....	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(909,000,000)	(859,600,000)	
Defense.....	71,584,000,000	70,295,200,000	71,584,000,000	70,132,320,000	69,936,620,000	-1,647,380,000
Transportation.....	⁴ 1,718,618,772	⁴ 1,530,198,372	⁴ 1,718,618,772	⁴ 1,651,407,272	⁴ 1,581,905,772	-136,713,000
Public works.....	4,867,813,000	4,622,922,000	4,867,813,000	4,776,064,000	4,689,938,000	-177,875,000
NASA.....	5,100,000,000	4,583,400,000	5,100,000,000	4,678,900,000	4,588,900,000	-511,100,000
Military construction.....	2,937,000,000	2,142,693,000	2,937,000,000	2,099,350,000	2,093,362,000	-843,638,000
Foreign assistance.....	3,818,736,000	2,775,011,000	3,818,736,000	3,313,345,000	2,876,591,000	-942,145,000
Supplemental (poverty, Appalachia, etc.).....	2,120,785,000	1,679,456,500	2,120,785,000	2,077,510,309	1,842,923,790	-277,861,210
Subtotal, 1968 bills.....	133,040,228,004	126,944,364,206	133,273,083,277	131,015,134,124	127,477,895,247	-5,795,188,030
Bills for fiscal 1967:						
Defense supplemental (Vietnam).....	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	12,196,520,000	-79,350,000
2d supplemental.....	2,134,932,833	2,041,826,133	2,257,604,652	2,260,246,933	2,197,931,417	-59,673,235
Subtotal, 1967 bills.....	14,410,802,833	14,238,346,133	14,533,474,652	14,456,766,933	14,394,451,417	-139,023,235
Total for the session.....	147,451,030,837	141,182,710,339	147,806,557,929	145,471,901,057	141,872,346,664	-5,934,211,265

¹ Permanent "appropriations" were tentatively estimated in January budget at about \$15,212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968. (All forms of permanent "new obligational authority" for 1968 were tentatively estimated in the January budget at \$17,452,899,000.)

² Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget, \$980,000,000; House bill, \$925,000,000; Senate bill, \$955,000,000; enacted, \$925,000,000).

³ And participation sales authorizations as follows: Independent Offices-HUD, \$3,235,000,000 in budget estimates, \$881,000,000 in House bill, \$3,235,000,000 in Senate bill and \$3,235,000,000

enacted; Labor-HEW, \$115,000,000 in budget estimates, House bill and enacted; State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary, \$150,000,000 in budget estimates, House bill, Senate bill and enacted; Agriculture, \$800,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill, \$700,000,000 in Senate bill and \$750,000,000 enacted. Total authorizations requested in budget, \$4,300,000,000; total in House bills, \$1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, \$4,085,000,000; total enacted, \$4,250,000,000.

⁴ Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for grants-in-aid for airports (budget \$75,000,000; House bill, \$65,000,000; Senate bill, \$75,000,000; enacted, \$70,000,000).

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation giving the effect of

the reductions under the "10 percent-2 percent" formula that was enacted as title II of House Joint Resolution 888.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:



Public Law 90-239
90th Congress, H. R. 14397
January 2, 1968

An Act

81 STAT. 773

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968,
and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1968") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, namely:

Supplemental
Appropriation
Act, 1968.

CHAPTER I

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Cochairman and his alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission and for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$745,750.

80 Stat. 414.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, except expenses authorized by section 105 and section 201 of said Act, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$56,700,000, to remain available until expended.

Ante, pp. 257,
258.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$2,200,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER III

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452, approved August 20, 1964), as amended, \$1,773,000,000: *Provided*, That those provisions of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 that set mandatory funding levels for programs newly authorized therein shall not be effective during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, of which not more than \$500,000 shall be available for transfer to the Department of Agriculture to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of Public Law 90-95, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for transfers to the economic opportunity loan fund for loans under title III, and amounts so transferred shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, as authorized by section 602 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for purchase of real property for training centers: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available for contracts under titles I, II, V, VI, and VIII extending for more than twenty-four months: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for any grant until the Director has determined that the grantee is qualified to administer the funds and programs involved in the proposed grant: *Provided further*, That all grant agreements shall provide that the General Accounting Office shall have access to the records of the grantee which bear exclusively upon the Federal grant.

78 Stat. 508.
42 USC 2701 note.
Ante, p. 672.

Ante, p. 231.

78 Stat. 528;
80 Stat. 1468.

GAO.
Access to records.

CHAPTER IV

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

SALARIES OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CLERICAL ASSISTANTS TO SENATORS

Effective January 1, 1968, the clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the State of Indiana shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of five million, the population of said State having exceeded five million inhabitants; and that the clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the State of New Jersey shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of seven million, the population of said State having exceeded seven million inhabitants.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Effective January 1, 1968, the Secretary may fix the compensation of the assistant reporter of debates at not to exceed \$17,860 gross per annum.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

FOLDING DOCUMENTS

For an additional amount for "Folding Documents", \$8,000.

POSTAGE STAMPS

For an additional amount for airmail and special delivery stamps for Senators and the President of the Senate, \$9,040: *Provided*, That the President of the Senate and each Senator from a State east of the Mississippi River shall be allowed an additional \$80, and each Senator from a State west of the Mississippi River shall be allowed an additional \$100.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Norma W. Younger, widow of J. Arthur Younger, late a Representative from the State of California, \$30,000.

None of the funds available to the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1968 shall hereafter be available for the purposes of House Resolution 416 of the Eighty-ninth Congress relating to the hire of student congressional interns.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

For an additional amount for "Extension of the Capitol", \$135,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Expansion of facilities, Capitol Power Plant".

SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For an additional amount for "Senate Office Buildings", \$231,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The second paragraph under the heading "Senate Office Buildings" in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966 (79 Stat. 1147), is amended by striking out "\$7,700" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$8,200". 40 USC 166b-3.

CHAPTER V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. Funds heretofore appropriated to the Department of the Army for the Libby Dam and Reservoir project in Montana may be
Kelley Flats,
Mont.
Airport facility,
construction.

used in an amount not to exceed \$140,000 in participation with local interests and the Federal Aviation Administration for the construction of an airport facility at Kelley Flats, Montana, in a manner deemed appropriate by the Chief of Engineers.

Approved January 2, 1968.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 1037 (Comm. on Appropriations) and No. 1047 (Comm. of Conference).

SENATE REPORT No. 938 (Comm. on Appropriations).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 113 (1967):

Dec. 12: Considered and passed House.

Dec. 14: Considered and passed Senate, amended.

Dec. 15: House and Senate agreed to conference report.